

THE WORLD AS POWER

CAUSALITY AND CONTINUITY

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE WORLD AS POWER

Power as Reality

Power as Life (Prāna-Shakti)

Power as Mind (Mānasī-Shakti)

Power as Matter (Bhūta-Shakti)

Power as Causality and Continuity

Power as Consciousness (Chit-Shakti)

(In Preparation)

also

Shakti and Shakta (2nd Ed.)

Garland of Letters

Bharata Shakti (3rd Ed.)

Seed of Race (2nd Ed.)

Is India Civilized (3rd Ed.)

THE WORLD AS POWER

CAUSALITY AND CONTINUITY

BY
SIR JOHN WOODROFFE
AND
PRAMATHANĀTHA MUKHYOPĀDHYAYA
(of National Council of Education, Bengal)

PUBLISHERS :
GANESH & CO., MADRAS
1923

PREFACE

THE portion of this book which deals with Causality is my work in the carrying out of which I am indebted to Dr. Seal's learned work "Positive Sciences of the Hindus". The second portion of this volume on Continuity has been written by Professor Pramathanātha Mukhyopādhyāya with whose collaboration I intend to publish the next volume of the series dealing with *Chit* or (to give this untranslatable word an English name) Consciousness. After a discussion of the essential terms, Reality, Consciousness, Mind, Life, Matter, Causality and Continuity, and possibly a few others such as Sangskāra or Tendency, the ground will have been prepared for the treatment of such special Shāstric subjects as Adhikāra, Sāadhanā-shakti, Mantra-shakti, Ritual in general, Yoga and so forth. It is more than useless to attempt to deal with such matters unless the philosophical terms I have mentioned are understood.

Bormes, Var
16th February, 1923

J. W.

ERRATA

| PAGE | NOTE | FOR | READ |
|------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| 33 | 47 | Schrader } <i>op. cit</i> } | Schrader } Ahirbudhnya } Samhita } |
| 34 | 48 | Apanchikrita | Apanchikrita |
| „ | 49 | Laya-Yoga | Laya Yoga |
| 35 | 51 | Sadriha | Sadrisha |
| 62 | last line } but one } | Vāhyendriya | bāhyendriya |

THE WORLD AS POWER

POWER AS CAUSALITY

§ 1

IT has been said¹ that causation has been involved in a denser dust of discussion especially since the days of Hume, than any other subject except Free Will which is intimately connected with cause and effect; and that there is no agreement among Psychologists as to the internal conviction nor among physicists as to the external relation. Many centuries however before Hume the same questions were discussed and it is to India that we owe the notable doctrine of the essential identity of Cause and Effect,² though we may read English works of Indian writers on

¹ Dr. McCosh, "First and Fundamental Truths," 207.

² Dr. Sterling. Gifford Lectures 279—287, who says "I suppose we owe all this to the Hindoos".

Causation rich in references to Berkeley, Hume, Mill, Herbert Spencer and others without mention of what India has said on the subject.³ I suppose Cinderella would not have minded neglect so much if it had not been that of her sisters. It will be found however that India has in its main heads fully dealt with the matter from the empirical, metaphysical, and absolute aspects of Reality according to the three Standards which constitute the Intellectual Body of Vedantic Truth as Spiritual Experience.

First then as to the internal conviction as to the truth of the principle of Causality, namely that there is no phenomenon without its cause. Is it derived from the individual's generalisation from his experience? It is not; because it is always and from the beginning associated with it. Moreover universal propositions cannot be established by limited perceptions. Nor is it a form in the Kantian sense of the understanding considered as

³ Therefore I would refer these and English readers to Dr. Seal's "Positive Sciences of the Hindus" where the subject is summarised from the Indian standpoint and the authorities are given.

isolated from and independent of the things presented to it. Whence then does it come? It is one of the innate tendencies or *Sangskāra* inherent in mind generated by its past experiences. These accumulated *Sangskāras* are in Indian philosophy the source of all our irresistible assumptions and convictions. Thus Kant contended that the persistent reality of the causal order is as necessary an assumption for our knowledge of the external world as time and space. World-experience does not justify these assumptions. But they are there as (it is said) the product of an infinite number of experiences in an infinite number of worlds. Mind is never in any Indian system a *Tabula Rasa* but is on the contrary a mine of impressions and tendencies. There is a given form of experience because there has always been a similar experience under similar circumstances. There is a given state of facts because there has always been a similar state of facts under similar conditions. This is the principle of the Uniformity of Nature in its Indian form. The pre-existent experience so postulated, though not without rational proof in its favour, cannot be established

with certitude by reason alone. In supersensible matters reason can only attain at the best conclusions of probability. The affirmation of pre-existence rests secondarily on *Shruti* or Revelation and primarily on actual experience in the form of that threefold supersensible knowledge (*Traividya*) which is concerned firstly with the cosmic history of the individual self and secondly with such history of others, both being effects in the general cosmic process, and thirdly with the cause of such process.⁴ If anyone says that he does not believe the possibility of such supersensible experience he is entirely within his rights and no one can possibly have any objection. But those who for any reason have satisfied themselves on this and other similar matters will not in their turn be affected merely by these doubts or denials unless they are of the class of persons who in this country are stampeded into immediate repudiation

⁴ Pūrvanivāsānusmṛiti, Parasattvānām cha utpatti jñānam, and the Jñāna regarding Pratītyasamutpāda or the origination of things after having experienced another thing referring to the evolutionary process.

on hearing merely the powerful Mantras "Science", "Superstition", "Progress" and the like.

But India has not been without Her own sceptics. Indeed from the Womb of Her Thinking She has thrown out every type of doctrine, Agnosticism, Scepticism, Materialism, Idealism, Atheism, Theism, Pantheism. May be that like a woman who has borne too many children Her fecundity has tired Her. The ancient sceptical school of Chārvākas held as against those who assumed the Principle of Causality as a ground of induction (*Vyāpti*) that it itself was an induction with the result that there was circular reasoning. Universal propositions cannot be established (they held) by limited perception. Every inference is based on an unconditional concomitance which must itself be inferred. There is thus a *regressus ad infinitum*. The *nexus* between cause and effect was only (they held) a notion based on former perception which by accident is found justified by the result in a number of cases. In a similar way Hume held that we do not apprehend any efficiency in the causal order but only a certain regularity of sequence

which contains no absolute guarantee of permanence. An 'effect' is only what habit leads us to expect. But a necessary connection that is possibility of inference between any two existent things cannot be based on a mere expectation which though it has never been falsified may yet some day be so. The Nyaya of the first Standard has produced in its later developments some of the greatest logic-choppers in the world, but in its earlier forms was both acute and sensible. Without assuming (as the Buddhists did) Causality as an *a priori* principle, and making deductions therefrom, and without holding (as they did) causal efficiency to be of the essence of empirical (relative) reality, the first Standard took its stand on observed concomitance. It admitted that strong objections might be urged on the basis of mere observation but held that they could not be answered by the canons of causality and essential identity proposed. Falling back on the rational practice of thinking persons it was content with a pragmatic certitude.⁵ It was held that the internal

⁵ See Seal, "Positive Sciences of the Hindus," 267—269.

conviction was sufficiently justified for all our practical purposes.

The Buddhists took another line of argument to the objection that whilst it is true that logical methods of induction may show how in particular cases the causal relation is to be established, yet this is only a method which itself requires a warrant. The Buddhists replied that pragmatic reasons assign a limit to doubt. If in any particular case the method was satisfied, the antecedent in question must be the cause, for there was no other to serve as such. If it is not the cause then there is none and this conclusion is in contradiction of the rational ground of all practice, since all volitional activity proceeds by implication on the principle of causality namely that there is no phenomenon without a cause. If things could happen without a cause, all motives to action would be baffled. The truth of the principle was held to be guaranteed by the same ultimate criterion of empirical reality as the truth of perception itself, namely, the correspondence between the rational and practical activity of the self.⁶

⁶ Seal, *op. cit.*, 259—261.

§ 2

The second Standard fully accepts the principle of Causality and efficiency in the transcendent sense of an unmoved Reality disturbing the rest (as equilibrium) of the active source of mind and matter and their energies. Through this co-operation Nature is dynamic. The third Standard similarly assumes the Principle of causality and efficiency with this difference that in lieu of two Principles it posits One of dual aspect, static as Being-Consciousness, kinetic as the Power of Becoming in which Being-consciousness weaves the garment for Itself, which is the unconscious (in themselves) psychic and material forces. The first in the Shaiva and Shākta doctrines is Shiva and the second Its Power or Shakti. But the two are in the Monistic schools one. Māyāvāda Vedānta whilst accepting such a view as empirically valid takes the last step and holds that in the absolute sense the Principle of causality and efficiency is as much Māyā as the universe to which it is applied.

As to the external relation, the First Standard held that cause and effect were two

distinguishable conditions of things in a relation of antecedence and consequence. Its doctrine of causation is that of the absolute non-existence of the produced before its actual production ;⁷ that is the effect is not latent in and essentially identical with the cause as in the next or Evolutionary Standard. As regards the relation of cause and effect it denies a nexus in the form of a supersensible power (*Atīndriya shakti*) in the cause to produce the effect, or an ultimate form which is supposed to be present whenever the effect is produced. For it such efficiency was neither a matter of observation nor legitimate hypothesis. A cause is thus the invariable, unconditional, immediately antecedent, sum of operative conditions, and the effect is the consequent phenomenon which results from the joint operation of the antecedent conditions. But it does not admit either as a matter of observation or legitimate hypothesis any transcendental *nexus* between cause and effect as supersensible Power :⁸ that is such productive

⁷ Which gives it its name *Asat-kārya-vāda*.

⁸ *Atīndriya shakti*.

metaphysical efficiency as is affirmed by the second Standard⁹ according to which the causal relation is one of identity. Causation takes place through kinetic operation in the nature of molar or molecular motion.¹⁰ There is in each case of causation a redistribution of the latter. Whilst the first Standard thus repudiates the notion of Transcendental Power (*Shakti*) in the mechanism of nature and natural causation, it does not deny but affirms the Power (*Shakti*) of the Lord in His creation of the Universe out of the pre-existing realities,¹¹ nor does it deny the existence of metaphysical conditions like merit (*Dharma*) which constitute a system of Moral Ends which fulfil themselves in and through the mechanical system and order of Nature.¹² The creation of the world takes place as an absolutely new creation¹³ by what is called *Yaugika-srishti* or conjunction of the nine

⁹ See Seal, *op. cit.*, 262.

¹⁰ *Bhautika parisanda*.

¹¹ *Īshvara* in this system has the three *shaktis* : *nitya jñāna*, *nitya ichchā*, *nitya kriyā*.

¹² Dr. Seal, *op. cit.*, 265—266.

¹³ Hence it is called *Ārambhavāda*.

eternally pre-existing entities (Dravya) with all their properties and relations.

Motion (Karma)¹⁴ is defined in the Commentary on the Vaisheshika Aphorisms as the unconditional cause of change of place in a particle which in its simplest form is instantaneous and as *Vega* or impressed motion, or momentum is a persistent tendency or physical *Sangskāra* implying therefore a series of motions.¹⁵ This motion is as we may see happening around us, conveyed from or communicated by one object to another. Final causality or motion is attributed by the First Standard to *Adrishta* (lit. "Unseen") which is resorted to in explanation of observed phenomena only when these cannot be derived in any way from the operation of known causes. Several classes of cases fall under this head such as the operation of the transcendental cause, Merit and Demerit¹⁶ which explains the conjunction and disjunction of

¹⁴ See Seal, *op. cit.*, 129—152.

¹⁵ *Vega* is either persistent tendency (*Sangskāra*) to motion or tendency to restitution of shape in elastic bodies.

¹⁶ *Dharma, Adharma*. That is a action in accordance with or contrary to the universal law.

Souls (*Ātmans*) with their bodies, or according to the law of *Karma* or action or the operation of moral causation as superimposed on the natural order; and the first motions in the primordial elements of matter¹⁷ at the beginning of creation. It is the Lord (*Īshvara*) who is, though Himself unmoved, the First Mover operating according to the law of the unseen causes or *Adrishta*. Motion therefore in this system is something communicated, and it is this communicated, as opposed to inherent motion or essential efficiency of the second standard, which constitutes the phenomenal cause of the first.

§ 3

The first Standard conceived the matter under discussion in a simple fashion. The world is reducible to certain eternal realities. These are brought together by God and form everything experienced in the Universe. The things so formed by the eternal realities are absolutely new productions which had no sort of existence whatever before their production.

¹⁷ *Paramānu*.

All moving things are moved by a force called *Kāla* which though different from and independent of other realities is in general relation with them. *Dik* again is the force of relative position. Final Causality or motion is attributed to *Adrishta* (lit. "Unseen") such as the first motions in the primordial elements of matter. *Adrishta* is only resorted to in explanation of observed phenomena when these cannot be derived in any way from the operation of known causes. In the universe so constituted causation takes place through molar and molecular Motion (*Karma*) which is the cause of change in place in a particle. This motion is conveyed by one body to another. Cause is one thing and effect is another. The former is the invariable, unconditional, immediately antecedent, sum of operative conditions and the latter or effect is the consequent phenomenon which results from the joint operation of the antecedent conditions. As already observed the power of movement is not lodged in matter itself. It is a distinct principle in general relation with it. There is nothing but the invariable unconditional time relation between the cause and effect. This Standard does not

admit either as matter of observation or legitimate hypothesis any nexus between cause and effect as metaphysical power (*Atīndriya shakti*) or productive efficiency inherent in the cause to produce the effect as posited in the second Standard. The cause is nothing other than an unconditional, invariable complement of operative conditions and the effect nothing other than the consequent phenomenon which results from the joint operation of the antecedent conditions. The Nyaya however while repudiating transcendental power (*Shakti*) in the mechanism of nature and natural causation does not deny the existence of metaphysical conditions like merit (*Dharma*) which constitute a system of moral ends that fulfil themselves in and through the mechanical system and order of nature.¹⁸

In the next state or Second Standard we are introduced to the concept of efficiency. It is not the invariable or unconditional succession which constitutes causation but it is the power in the cause which produces the invariable succession. In other words the concept of

¹⁸ Seal; *op. cit.*, 262 *et seq.*

efficiency is essential to the causal relation. This is based on the fact of the individual man's sense of power and the consciousness of it, or on the experience of subjective activity as such which has been regarded as a primary or the sole source of this concept of efficiency. This subjective consciousness of power as the original experience from which the concept of efficiency is derived has been held to be a justification of its validity ; that is there is in fact power in the cause to produce the effect. As so conscious we have the feeling that in human activity we are in the Power-house itself. It is objected that this is a mere ejective interpretation, a projection of our consciousness of power into the outside world. The world outside us does not give the concept of efficiency except we read what we are conscious of into it. We do not sense power or initiative force anywhere. In fact causation is a notion derived from our own conscious activity. This is true as also that it is Consciousness which makes the very change of nature intelligible to us.¹⁹

¹⁹ See as to this and the concept of Energy generally the skilful criticism from the Advaita

Nevertheless we may support the dynamic view of the universe on the Monistic principles of the Shākta system. Mind and matter are twin aspects of the Mother-Power (Mahā-Shakti). They are themselves forms of power in differing degrees of contraction (*Saṅgkocha*). Power exists in either case, though in man's mind only it is revealed together with the consciousness of it. It is true that efficiency is discovered not outside but within us. But if it did not exist all would not make discovery of it. The charge of anthropomorphism only succeeds against those who altogether sever mind and matter, the intelligible from the sensible. It is however a formally valid criticism that the unity on which this argument is based is not itself established. This calls in question the truth of Monism itself. Sāṅkhyan dualism gives independent reality to motion or change. It may be objected²⁰ that these as absolute, objective, independent occurrences have in themselves

Vedānta standpoint in *Metaphysics of Energy* by G. R. Malkani published by the Indian Institute of Philosophy Amalner (E. Khandesh).

²⁰ See "Metaphysics of Energy," n. 21 ante.

no meaning, for their meaning is in Consciousness which by giving meaning to succession demonstrates its own persistence, which as conscious continuity by creating time and space proves its own timelessness and spacelessness, thus as the Monistic Vedanta says, giving testimony of consciousness as the Self being the sole basis or reality. But can reason establish anything more than that motion or change has no meaning independent of Consciousness? We make a further step when we say that there is in fact only one reality namely Consciousness, a position for which we may argue but which cannot be established with certitude except by an actual or direct experience of unity. Those who seek to establish supersensible (*Atīndriya*) truths on any other ground must fail: just as those who argue against the validity of the individual's experience must fail. It is his experience, adduce what facts and arguments you will against it.²¹

²¹ It is the truth *for him* however much others may refuse to accept such experience as truth for themselves. It is only alleged sense-knowledge which is capable of verification or refutation.

§ 4

In the second Standard there are two ultimate Realities, existing independently the one of the other, namely the class of Selves (*Purushas*) whose nature is Consciousness and the psycho-physical Principle (*Prakriti*). When the two Principles are associated as in world-experience there is consciousness identifying itself with its vehicles of mind and matter. Where they are dissociated then Consciousness is alone in its aloofness (*Kaivalya*). These two in association are the efficient and material causes respectively of the universe, whilst in Vedānta there is only one Reality which in different aspects is efficient and material cause. True efficiency is the power to initiate change that is the power of X to affect Y whilst X itself is unaffected and remains at rest. If the agent X is itself moved then it becomes a patient. This efficiency is transcendental and not the ordinary notion of efficiency of science which has no metaphysical support. Lotze says "There cannot be an inner state of anything such as to be for that thing the condition of

its being in another particular state". It is in fact impossible even to conceive X moving Y in the world of things without the former itself moving in the act of moving the latter. If X moves then it must be moved from outside. The agent which is moved and moves does not initiate but merely communicates an impulse which it has itself received from outside. In the phenomenal world the moving cause can only be conceived as part of an universe which by the configuration of its other parts helps to determine its movements. No element whether animate or inanimate can be conceived as moving itself because everything remains at rest until it is moved through a cause outside itself. And once recourse is had to outside causes the notion of efficiency is lost.²² In the universe as it exists there is an unending change of cause and effect, each movement therein being result of a previous one and the cause of that which follows. It is common doubtless to speak of the self-initiated movements of animate being. It is not affirmed that there is true efficiency in

²² See *Metaphysics of Energy*, by G. R. Malkani.

the case of such movements, but that the movement of living substance is not necessarily dependent on mechanical propulsion by something else from outside. In fact some altogether deny spontaneity of movement in living bodies attributing their movements to the colloid and chemical reactions of the mobile beings and the medium. But however this be, no true efficiency, as above defined, is discoverable in any form of phenomenal being as such. True efficiency only exists in their ultimate Cause. In Sāṅkhya the Psycho-physical Principle is essentially active. It is never at rest. No cause is thus required to set it in motion. Consciousness (Purusha) is efficient in the sense that it determines the equilibrium of the former principle so that it deploys and manifests itself in the psychical and physical variety with which the unity of consciousness identifies itself.

The Psycho-physical principle is composed of three Factors, Moments, or Aspects²³ which are a tendency towards Activity

²³ Guna; translated as quality but which also means strand or thread. The Root is threefold like the twisted sacred thread of the Brāhmaṇa.

that is what is efficient in any phenomenon,²⁴ and which may work upon either of the other two factors²⁵ which are tendencies towards the Manifestation²⁶ or Veiling of Consciousness in that phenomenon²⁷ respectively. The very nature of Energy is efficiency to do work, to overcome resistance and to produce motion. All energy is therefore kinetic, even potential energy being energy of Motion in imperceptible forms. And so it is said of the essentially active Root-Energy-Stuff of the universe or Prakriti²⁸ that it has both homogeneous²⁹ and heterogeneous or

²⁴ Rajas Guna.

²⁵ Making one suppress the other.

²⁶ Sattva guna. It is that in the Material Cause which serves as the medium for reflection of the Sat or Consciousness of the efficient cause the Purusha. It is therefore the conscious element as mind in the Phenomenon.

²⁷ Tamas Guna counteracting the tendency to conscious manifestation. physically manifesting as the mass and inertia of Matter which as such is the unconscious element in the Phenomenon.

²⁸ Pra + kriti = before creation or She from Whom production begins or She by whom all actions (Kriti) are done. Actions = Srishti (production), Sthiti (maintenance), Laya (Dissolution).

²⁹ Sadrisha or Sarūpa parināma.

heteropathic change.³⁰ By the former is meant 'change in its own given condition'. The changed state is equivalent to the changing state. Thus the threefold Factors of the Root which is the material cause of the future and still unmanifested universe are in a state of equilibrium. The Root even then changes so as to maintain this state of equilibrium the change not upsetting the equilibrium. It changes because activity of some kind is of its essence. The reason is that the inherent tendency to manifestation is counterbalanced by the resistance of the Factor which in produced nature is called mass resistance, stability, or inertia. Consciousness as the *Purusha* is the efficient agent for the destruction of this equilibrium and the manifestation of the universe to Consciousness through the Mind with which the latter identifies itself. In manifestation however Change is heterogeneous. Manifestation involves varied collocations of energy. One relation of the Factors then changes into another different from it and so on with the result that Causation is a transformation of the homogeneous origin into

³⁰ Visadrisha or Virūpa parināma.

the heterogeneous effects which are the varied universe of Mind and Matter.

As stated, consciousness as efficient cause of movement does not itself move. We may seek a physical analogy in the nature of catalytic activity. In a chemical substance which is possessed of catalytic action the latter effects something and yet does not itself (so far as we can see) get transformed nor lose anything of its mass or potential during that chemical activity. Such a substance does not combine with the others which it influences but it (by its presence) influences others in proximity to one another to combine and to become themselves the seat of chemical activity and transformation. All such bodies therefore lose nothing and gain nothing and so keep themselves what they were. They naturally cease to influence if isolated from material to act upon. Their activity in the sense of influence would have a final terminal should they be altogether and permanently isolated which is the meaning of *Kaivalya*.³¹

³¹ As applied to the Purusha detached from Prakriti, Kaivalya is isolation or Aloofness when Consciousness as Purusha dissociates Itself from Prakriti.

Action may thus be apparently caused or directed by a body which itself undergoes no change.³² Whilst this example illustrates the changelessness of the Efficient Cause it does not bring out to view the apparent combination of the two Principles. In the Shāstra in order to explain the nature of this influence, recourse is had to the analogy of the reflection of a red flower in a crystal. The former and all its movements are reflected in the crystal but the latter is in itself unchanged. This illustration has the merit of showing both influence and apparent combination of both the Realities. Whatever analogy be applicable³³ the substance of the doctrine is that one Principle affects another without the former

³² So platinum will cause action without itself undergoing any kind of change which can be detected by the chemist; and so with other bodies. This is without loss to itself just as from an initial magnet any number of others can be made without loss to the generating magnet.

³³ In fact the Scriptures declare that the matter is Apratarkya, that is beyond all human discussion and conception. Our analysis must from the nature of the case be limited and imperfect. See Hymn to Prakriti in Prapanchasāra Tantra, Vol. 3, Tantrik Texts Ed., A. Avalon.

really combining with it and thus being affected and undergoing any change.

We may leave physical analogies which are necessarily crude, though not without effect, for those who live in the actions and reactions of matter, and endeavour to explain the subjects from the psychical standpoint. In this view we may say that Nature always actively "works for" that is shows Herself to the consciousness which associates itself with Her. To the consciousness which discovers its true nature and that it is other than and separated from mind and matter She withdraws herself. Until then Consciousness which identifies itself with Mind and Matter continues to be the efficient cause of their production. All Mind and Matter and their energies are contained in the Original Energy-stuff: so that manifestation is an unfolding. This is the doctrine of the existence of the product in a potential form in the cause prior to its actual manifestation as effect.³⁴ Things are not formed out of pre-existing materials as new creations, but products already exist in a potential form in the original productive principle. They

³⁴ It is therefore called Sat-Kārya-vāda.

simply unroll themselves out from this potential state as a tree unrolls itself from out the seed. The Cause holds within it the effect potentially. The effect is the cause modified. Cause and effect in the universe are different positions and states of conditionedness of the same thing in the time-sequence. The effect is in the cause and the cause exists in the effect which is only the cause manifested in a collocation.³⁵ The effect which is potential is actualised. Nothing which is produced is something entirely new. The manifestation or causation of an effect is only the passage from potentiality to actuality. Cause and effect are thus essentially (that is as to substance-energy as distinct from collocation) one. The X which is virtually the cause is the same X which is virtually the effect.

The Factors of the Root, notwithstanding their transformation into diverse forms, are neither created nor destroyed and are eternal. The totality of Mass³⁶ and Energy³⁷ remains

³⁵ Kāranasyaiva sangsthānamātram. Cf. Seal, *op. cit.*, 89.

³⁶ Tamas.

³⁷ Rajas.

constant if account be taken both of the actual and potential. But the concrete phenomenal modes evolved in this process are subject to growth and decay, which are only due to changes of collocation and consequent changes of state from the potential to the actual. The course of evolution conforms to a fixed law inherent in the transforming whole, the transformation of which is constant and not arrested for a moment. There is thus both transformation and conservation of Energy. As the total Energy remains the same while the world is constantly evolving, cause and effect are only more or less evolved forms of the same ultimate Root-Energy Stuff. The sum of effects exists in the sum of Causes in a potential or unevolved form. What is called the material cause or sum of material causes is only the Power which is efficient in the production, or rather the vehicle of that Power. This Power is the potential form of the Energy set free in the effect through concomitant conditions necessary to call forth the so called material cause into activity. There is liberation of potential Energy following on the action of the proximate efficient cause or concomitant

condition. The causal operation of these lies in the fact that they supply the stimulus which liberates the potential energy stored up in a given collocation. Everything in the phenomenal world is a special collocation of the three Factors of the Root cause. The sum of material causes potentially contains the Energy manifested in the sum of effects : and in the passage from potency to actualisation the effectuating condition (concomitant cause), when it is itself accomplished, is only a step in the evolutionary series which adds a specific stimulus and renders determinate that which was previously indeterminate. When the effectuating condition is added to the sum of material conditions in a given collocation, all that happens is that a stimulus is imparted which removes the arrest, disturbs the relatively stable equilibrium and brings on a liberation of energy together with a fresh collocation. Non-material (in the sense of subtle) concomitants like Merit and Demerit³⁸ do not supply any moving force or Energy to the sum of material conditions but only remove the arrest or state of relatively stable

³⁸ Dharma and Adharma.

equilibrium in a given collocation.³⁹ The order of evolution follows a definite law inherent in the root-cause and its manifestations. The cosmic order is one and fixed but comprehends divers series arising from different combinations of original Factors which constitute subordinate or particular laws of cause and effect. The qualities of things are only modes of Energy acting in those collocations sometimes actual and other times potential. The Original Energy is one and ubiquitous and everything therefore exists in everything else potentially⁴⁰ without prejudice to the generic and specific differences of things. Inorganic matter, vegetable and animal organisms are essentially and ultimately one, so far as mass and energy are concerned, but the varied forms of Energy and the generic and specific qualities or properties of things (which are but modes of Energy) follow a definite and unalterable law (which we observe in the phenomenal world) in the order of their appearance and succession under conditions of space, time, mode, and causality

³⁹ As the owner of a field removes the barrier in flooding his field from a reservoir of water.

⁴⁰ Sarvam sarvātmakamiti.

and hence all effects do not manifest themselves at once.⁴¹ The category of causality is mediated through the scheme of order in time. The empirical intuition first superimposes relations of antecedence and sequence on changing phenomena and the understanding out of these relations creates order in time. The empirical intuition then intuits the phenomenal series of transformations of Energy in this Time-order and in so doing imparts the relation of cause and effect into Nature.⁴²

It is to be noted that the Energy which Mind, Life, and Matter display is of a transcendental nature. That is it is not the energy of forms of mind and matter considered in and by themselves, but it is the one infinite Energy of the Original Principle of which they are both limited psycho-physical modes.

§ 5

The Third Standard as Vedānta in its Monistic form holds that the measurable

⁴¹ Dr. Seal, *op. cit.*, 13—18 which I summarise and in which the authorities are given.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 22.

universe is reducible to one Reality alone, the Brahman, the Immeasurable or Immense. We may consider the matter first from the empirical standpoint of Shākta doctrine. Here in lieu of the plurality of Selves (*Purusha*), there is the one Changeless Consciousness or Shiva who, relative to the world, is efficient cause. The world is not something which has a reality independent of Consciousness. It is the transforming and transformed Power or Shakti of Shiva who is the Divine Mother of the Universe. The Mother as Material cause is in Herself (*Svarūpa*) one with Shiva⁴³ who is Consciousness-being-bliss. The material cause is not thus, as the Sāṅkhyas affirm, something unconscious. The Mother-Energy is the Source of all mind, life, and matter and their Energies which are all modes of Her as Substance-Energy. The Power which evolves the world is both Consciousness (*Chit Shakti*) and *Māyā*⁴⁴ or

⁴³ Chidrūpinī.

⁴⁴ *Māyā* means that by which a thing is 'measured' that is limited, (*Miyate anena iti Māyā*) the principle which imposes forms on the formless. Some explain it as *Mā* (not) *Yā* (That), i.e., that which is the contrary of the infinite That without attributes.

the finitising power (*Māyā-Shakti*) which manifests as mind and matter. Neither Shiva nor Shakti in themselves, that is as Being-consciousness-bliss, change, but Shakti is the Principle of Change and assumes the changing forms which constitute the universe. Here also there is a relation of essential identity between cause and effect. Consciousness remains one and unchanged, immanent in all mind and matter: and the latter are essentially one as regards Substance-Energy. There is true causal efficiency in its transcendental sense. But the efficient and material causes are not two independent Principles but twin aspects of the one Reality in whom inhere both. Causal efficiency is the very essence of Reality in its Power-aspect and it is this efficiency which is inherent and manifested in all things in the universe which are the transformations of the Mother-Energy-Substance (*Mahāshakti*) one in Herself with Consciousness.

It is to be observed however that there is a difference between the modes of operation in the evolution of the world, that is of its constitutive principles and in the world so constituted.

In the case of transformation of Energy-Substance in the world itself, the result of the cosmic process above described, the cause ceases to exist as cause immediately before and when the effect comes into existence. Thus as the Lakshmī Tantra says "in the world milk loses its nature immediately when it becomes curd (there is curd only not milk and curd)" but this does not apply to the Supreme Cause and Its process for the quality⁴⁵ of that Cause is Vīrya,⁴⁶ that is unaffectedness in spite of being the transforming material cause.⁴⁷ This principle is applicable in the case of both the second and third Standards or Sāṅkhyan and Vedāntic systems respectively. In cosmic evolution the cause when transforming itself into the effect remains what it is as cause. The effect (as effect) is the cause modified but the cause (as cause) remains what it was, is, and will be. This must obviously be so, otherwise with the evolution into effect the cause would disappear in it and so on until the last of the evolved

⁴⁵ Guna.

⁴⁶ This term here=Vikāra-rahita.

⁴⁷ Schrader *op.*, *cit.*, 33.

principles was reached when all the antecedent principles would have disappeared in the last. But the universe exists as a combination of those constituent principles.⁴⁸

The evolutionary process is also in both cases reversible that is cosmically. In manifested Nature there is continuous degradation until the terminal of activity as the whole universe is reached. Could the reversibility of the processes of life be discovered we might then see the adult organism led back through the successive stages of its development to the primitive germ whence it sprung. Hathayoga may in degree arrest degradation and give a reverse tendency to individual organic process.⁴⁹

⁴⁸ Thus in Sāṅkhya, Prakṛiti becomes Mahat and remains Prakṛiti, Mahat becomes Ahaṅkāra and remains Mahat and so on. And in the 36 Principles (Tattvas) of the Śhaiva and Śhāktas, Śhiva-Śhakti Tattva evolves Sadākhya and remains as they were, Sadākhya evolves Ishvara Tattva and remains Sadākhya. In the Māyāvāda scheme there is not the same chain of development because Matter, Life and Mind are derived from the different Guna aspects of the Universals (Apanchikṛita Tanmātra.) But the Tanmātras themselves are evolved similarly from Māyā the material cause.

⁴⁹ In Kundalinī or Laya-yoga the individual actually retraces the stages of the cosmic evolution and becomes one with the initial Energy in its form as

But it is the work of Cosmic Power to withdraw as a whole what it has ejected as modes of itself. This is *Pralaya* or dissolution of the universe when the two Radical Principles alone are.

In this connection it may be observed that to Aristotle the "First Mover" must be functioning actuality, absolute *Energeia* for were it only potential *Dunamis* there were no reason, so far as it was only that, it should become actual. It has absolutely actual being which moves out of itself and returns to itself. The potential presupposes preceding actuality. What is potential may or may not be. There is no absolute beginning of this process: and so it has been said "that no Theist can assign a first to Deity nor atheist a first to the systems of things in time."⁵⁰ The Sāṅkhyan Material Cause as Energy-Stuff is prior to manifestation a state of equilibrated inner activity⁵¹ associated with the efficient Cause (*Purusha*), and in Vedānta the efficient and material causes are

* Consciousness. For this Yoga proceeds on a Monistic basis.

⁵⁰ Dr. Sterling. Gifford Lectures (1890), 126.

⁵¹ Sadriha parināma.

aspects of the One Reality the Whole and Full (*Pūrṇa*) with all-mighty Power.⁵² Neither in Sāṅkhya nor in this or other Vedāntic schools is the universe the production of something absolutely new : but there is an unfolding or development in the sense that what previously existed in a subtle form in the Cause is made explicit and gross in the effect.⁵³ In the Vedāntic schools the Lord is the efficient cause.

§ 6

Before stating the doctrine of Vedānta from its transcendental standpoint in which all Causality is as much *Māyā* as the universe itself it is necessary to consider further the question of the relation of essential identity of cause and effect as held by the second Standard and by the third on its empirical side. Cause and effect may be complete or partial. By 'complete cause' is meant the attitude of the universe as whole at the antecedent moment and the 'complete effect' is the

⁵² Sarva shaktimaya.

⁵³ In Madhva's dualism it is exceptionally held that God is not the material cause of the universe.

attitude of the universe as a whole at the subsequent moment. When dealing with the complete cause external influences are excluded that is influences not within the system itself.⁵⁴

As to the treatment of Causality there are thus two standpoints namely the ordinary pragmatic standpoint which deals not with the universe of Fact but with Fact-sections⁵⁵ and the philosophic standpoint which tries to deal, so far as possible, with the universe itself. Thus from the first view-point the cause of an eclipse of the moon is the falling of the shadow of the earth⁵⁶ on her. From the second view-point the cause is the condition of the universe as a *whole* at the antecedent moment, that is the antecedent attitude of the universe, and the effect is the consequent

⁵⁴ Thus a seed is growing to be a plant. Here external influences are those external to the forces which constitute the seed such as soil, air, sunshine rain and so forth. These are partial causes as is also the attraction of the earth producing the effect namely the fall of the apple.

⁵⁵ See Prof. P. N. Mukhyopādhyāya's "Approaches to Truth" and "Patent Wonder".

⁵⁶ Rahu who is said to "devour" the moon is called Bhūchhāyā or Earth-Shadow. All the ancients were not so infantile as is sometimes supposed.

attitude of the universe, that is the condition of the universe as a *whole* at the subsequent moment. In this case the cause and effect are not held apart and one set of things held to be the cause and the other the effect. The whole as cause is the cause of the whole as effect—the state of the whole which exists first being called the cause, and the other which follows the effect, though the two are essentially one, distinguishable by the specific arrangement of Matter and Force. In the instance given the physical universe as a whole must be in a certain attitude in order that the sun, moon, and earth may be in conjunction and thereby cause the eclipse. Neither sun nor moon can be torn apart from the physical system and treated in an isolated manner. The cause or “antecedent assemblage of conditions” is really the antecedent attitude of the system as a whole. The effect also is not circumscribed to the particular section which we care to notice. It is as wide as the consequent attitude of the universe as a whole. But the ordinary outlook is narrow. Science tries to broaden it; Philosophy to complete. From the ordinary

standpoint the equality of the cause and effect relates to Matter and Force, though in some cases scientific analysis must supplement or correct ordinary analysis in the proof of such equality. But as regards their collocation and distribution it is evident that there is no apparent equality, a point with which I will next deal.

It is obvious that if the cause is absolutely identical with the effect there is no efficient causation at all. But we do, it is said, see "Becoming" that is continuous natural process. Hence arises the notion of relative sameness through a series of changes, stages, positions. In so far as any of the determining conditions of an aspect of reality remain unchanged, in so far that aspect is said to be continuous. The reality of Becoming involves continuity of transition. All natural processes are conceived as continuous. Motion cannot be perceived without continuity. But this continuity again must be relative. For if there be continuity in its strictest sense the cause becomes coincident with the effect, all process becomes impossible and therefore all differences are abolished. Continuity of transition is a

necessary presupposition without which Becoming is inconceivable. What however practically is our experience? Objectively we only know successive positions, mere static points. Forms succeed one another in the natural process. Nextly differences of quality are shown in these successive forms. This diversity and succession of forms, discontinuous in themselves, set up the appearance of motion. The forms are many and mutually exclusive. Objectively then all that we know are successive static points which are plural, diverse, different in quality, discontinuous in themselves. The points as objectively given are discrete and unconnected. We do not see transition between one form and another, the melting of one form into another. If we accept process and with it real differences of form, continuity becomes meaningless, for that which exists as a limit only cannot become another limit continuously. Nevertheless the notion of continuity is imposed on us being involved in the notions of causation, energy and motion. Our experience is apparently not of simultaneity. The terms of reality are successive because mutually exclusive. The cause of the reality of X

is not thought of as existing contemporaneously with, but as having arisen before, X. Motion cannot be constructed by any number of mere static points. For such points always involve a gap between them with result that there is a series of discontinuous points but no motion. What is done by an experiencer is to fill in these gaps by a subjective content. Objectively there is apparently no place for continuity. As regards causation we conceive of an ideal abstraction or Substance-Energy which is the unchanged ground beneath all changes of form which take place in it and we give to the static points a sort of movement and construct the image of a line.⁵⁷

The universe, it is admitted, evolves. Evolving is also changing in a sense. Something is evolving. If there was absolutely no difference in any respect the "what" which in fact evolves would not evolve at all, for it would ever remain what it is. Yet there is something which does so remain. What so remains is the substance, stuff or material and the total amount of energy or Shakti (kinetic

⁵⁷ For a fuller treatment of Continuity see the Second Part.

or static) working upon or in the substance. Thus if the complete cause be X and the complete effect Y then $X=Y$ as regards the matter in them (Shakti as material cause) and as regards the energy in them (Shakti as efficient cause). But as there is change, and the effect is the cause in some way modified, there is something in respect of which cause and effect in appearance differ, though as regards substance and energy they are the same. This is the collocation or distribution of the matter⁵⁸ in it and the collocation or composition or diagram of the forces in it. It is these which constitute what is called in Māyāvāda Vedānta "Name and Form".⁵⁹ From the standpoint of this Vedantic school, Name and Form, as changing things, are *Asat* that is the contrary of constant and

⁵⁸ Vishishtarūpa.

⁵⁹ Nāmarūpa : These produced changes or Vikāras such as a pitcher made of earth are names and forms and are *Asat*, a term which is better translated non-persistent and not "unreal," whereas the Earth, *i.e.*, the substance is alone *Sat* (relatively) persistent. The degree of persistency a thing possesses is its *Sat*. *Sat* is that which eternally and for all time is *Sat*. *Asat* is that which is *Sat* for a time and becomes *Asat* at some time.

permanent. Their Stuff and Energy are *Sat* as relatively (that is in the world) constant and permanent. If reality be determined by the possession of these characteristics then (according to this definition) the Name and Form are unreal and Substance-Energy are real. Hence $X=Y$.

The analysis of effect above given applies not only to material but to vital⁶⁰ and psychic effects.⁶¹ An analysis of the Cause gives us the same scheme.

From the Indian philosophic standpoint the view taken is that the subsequent total attitude of the universe is the unfolding or evolution (as regards the types⁶² at least) of

⁶⁰ Pranic.

⁶¹ e.g., in a mental effect say anger: the Substance=Mind stuff (Antahkarana): Energy=force of the predispositions (Sangskāra)+forces of exciting cause or causes. The form (Vishishtarūpa) of that anger is its special form as a psychic state (it is not anger in the abstract but anger as a particular mental state in a particular person at a particular time) and the form of the Sangskāras, etc., is the particular arrangement of them which represents that anger as an actual presentation into the mind.

⁶² These generals or universals called Parajāti are held in the Cosmic Mind as Mahat which corresponds to the Buddhist Sangskāra in the chain of causation. These types are a form of pure being

the antecedent total attitude of the universe. Putting aside for the moment the question of Types and their variations, that is whether there is any real variation at all, cause and effect are equal also not only as regards substance-energy but as to the collocation and distribution of matter and force. In what way? If we imagine an evolving "what" as a solitary something evolving without external influence or environment, the general scheme of collocation or distribution may be the same in both⁶³ but it cannot be said that the *actual* collocation or distribution of matter and force in the cause is the same in the effect. If it were there would be no change. But evolution means change. From this it follows that the matter and force are redistributing themselves without however giving up the general scheme of distribution. As regards such redistribution there is a difference that is as regards particular

(Sattā) the correspondence of which in the rational world is the power to form and hold generals. But in this latter world the particulars are explicit.

⁶³ e.g., when a small crystal forms into a large one in the solution the scheme of configuration of the molecules remains the same. Thus the cubic shape does not change though the size increases.

forms.⁶⁴ Hence while basic matter-form (for the two may be regarded as one) together with their typical arrangements also persists, the actual form does not. If we take⁶⁵ persistence as the mark of the Real and the Real to be only that which does so persist, then we may eliminate the changing characteristics of name and form as unreal in which case again $X=Y$ for the residue is constant. If however whilst we regard the ultimate Cause as the *Ens Realissimum* we give to change or non-persistence a relative reality of its own, then unity can only consist in the identity of the cause which remains the same as cause even when variously self-modified as effect. The *Shākta* view that a thing changes as regards appearance (collocation, etc.) and yet does not change that is persists as regards energy and substance can only equate $X=Y$ by ignoring the difference in collocation or experience, and the reason why X and Y being identical in substance and energy still differ as regards experience. Not only the appearances of X and Y but also the reason of the

⁶⁴ *Nāmarūpa*.

⁶⁵ As the *Advaita Vedānta* of *Śaṅkara* does.

difference in appearance is ignored. Without ignoring them we cannot equate X and Y. The identity is affirmed by reference to Revelation as direct spiritual experience without attempt to effect explanation in terms of reason. It is the inscrutable (Achintya) Power of God. Shang-kara is formally able to ignore them by defining his reality or Sat as that which persists so that from this standpoint $X=Y$ because the collocation of X and that of Y and their reasons do not persist and are therefore the contrary of Sat or Asat.

Thus the pluralism of the first Standard deals with nine independent entities their properties and relations. Of these matter is moved not by any inherent Energy but by another independent force called *Kāla*. The motion of one thing is communicated to another. All that is observed is this motion. Cause and effect are two things, and whether one stands to the other in the relation of cause and effect depends on its invariable unconditional, immediate, antecedence. Here we have the empirical notion of cause. The second Standard reduces these Realities to two only and introduces the notion of

efficiency which is attributed to one of these namely Consciousness. The other, the Psycho-physical Principle, is inherently active and the cause of its movements is not to be sought outside itself. The relation of Cause and Effect is one of identity. Here we have the notion of causation as metaphysical efficiency. So also in Monistic Vedānta when viewed from the empirical standpoint : only here the efficient and material cause are aspects of one Reality. Lastly from the absolute standpoint there is no causation at all : the notion having empirical validity only.

POWER AS CONTINUITY

§ 1

AS the notion of Causality is based upon the more fundamental notion of Continuity, I propose to deal with the latter in this second part. In the present Series as well as elsewhere, Experience, Consciousness, Ākāsha have, in many places, been described as 'Continuum'. Now, with regard to this, we have to satisfy ourselves, if we are to probe deeper into the matter, that, *firstly*, the idea of Continuity is a fundamental and concrete idea (as distinguished from a mere mental abstraction); *secondly*, the idea is grounded in fact, or in other words, the Continuum really exists and is not only fabricated by the mind; *thirdly*, the idea as well as the reality of Continuity manifests itself in thought and in the world order in a variety of forms of which Causality is one. Our problem reduces itself therefore, in this second part, to three questions: (a) Is the

idea of Continuity a native expression of the Given or Experience, or is it something constructed by imagination and superimposed upon the order of Experience? In other words, Is it a datum of Experience or is it only a mental construct? (b) Supposing that Experience involves this idea as its original presentation, the next query is: Does the Continuum *really* exist? Is existence really continuous? While the first is an epistemological question, the second is a metaphysical question. The first enquires as to whether the idea is *given* in Experience, the second as to whether it is *valid*. (c) The next question is—In what forms does Continuity evolve in thought and in reality? *Prima facie*, the ideas of Uniformity and Causality amongst others seem to be forms of the idea of Continuity; are they so? So also, Consciousness, Time, Space amongst others seem to be actual forms of Continuity; are they so? Besides these three theoretical queries, we may have a practical one, *viz.*: (d) The Continuum, though it may be given in Experience and really exist, often seems to be veiled in the representation of Experience; now, how can we realise what has thus been

veiled? In other words, How can we *live* in consciousness the Whole and the Perfect (*Akhanda* and *Pūrṇa*) which we perhaps really are?

§ 2

The first question then is: Is Experience continuous or discontinuous? In seeking to answer this question we must avoid on one hand the mistake of Sensationist Philosophy, and on the other, the illusion of "common sense". The former is committed to the view that our perception can only give us "points of sensation" or the "manifold" of experience which are always discrete. Our mental life is thus a "series" of impressions and ideas (to adopt Hume's classification) which do *not* constitute a continuous flow or "stream" (as supposed by William James and others) of experience. The idea of continuity in Time and in Space is a mental construct—and may be an illusion like the notion of an objective causal nexus. Our sense-experience gives us "facts" which are discrete, discontinuous, finite, particular. This psychology of Hume, Mill, Bain and others, and taken up by many

physicist philosophers, which would seek to explain the phenomena of experience by the association of atoms of sensation, involves a fundamental mistake. Experience is never built up in that way. Experience never begins with, and never is, atoms or points of sensation. It always is a continuum, a universe. As such it is the Given, the Fact.¹ The discrete points of sensation are obtained by dissociation, analysis, veiling or ignorance of the Whole.² The whole is always an undefined and undefinable universe of sounds, sights, smells, touches, tastes, organic sensations, ideas, feelings, hopes, fears, likes, dislikes, desires, etc. These constitute a seamless, alogical mass. The "elements" surprise one another, are discriminated from one another, not in presentation but in representation, not in perception but in review. It is true that the distribution of attentive interest is not homogeneous and uniform over the whole field: that while some parts are on the apex of the curve of presentation, others lie more

¹ See Professor P. N. Mukhyopadhyāya's "Approaches to Truth" and "Patent Wonder".

² See the volume on "Mind"—Extensiveness.

or less nearly on the slopes. By reason of such preferential and in-equal distribution of interest, there arises the distinction between what William James would call the "substantive states" and the "states of transition," the "warm and intimate" tracts of consciousness and the "fringe" of consciousness. It is the non-recognition of the states of transition, the fringe, etc., constituting the slopes of the complete curve of presentation, which is accountable for the fantastic psychology of the sensationist philosophers reducing our mental life to isolated, disconnected "points" of sensation only.³ Mental life is never a manifold of discrete elements, a series: it is *always* a continuum. This continuum which is ever given is ignored for *practical* purposes, and only points of sensation which happen to serve some practical purposes or other are noted. The points or portions thus especially noted are regarded by us as constituting the *whole* experience of the given moment; the rest, though actually given, are ignored by us,

³ See the volume on "Mind" for a criticism of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika view of Mind making it *anu* or Point only.

and hence become veiled. When, for example, I am gazing at the star Sirius in a clear night, my whole experience is supposed to be concentrated for the time being at that particular star, while, really, my total experience at that time is a universe involving not only a more or less veiled presentation of many neighbouring stars, but of many imperfectly attended sounds, smells, touches, organic sensations, ideas, memories, etc. Experience at that moment is a continuum, seamless, indefinable, alogical: it undoubtedly involves many elements, but these are not yet logically discriminated *as* elements. This entire experience as given is the Fact. But I am not ordinarily interested in the whole; I am interested in parts or segments. The parts I am especially interested in are especially attended to, and are emphasised: they constitute, so to say, the crests of the continuous waves of presentation. The experiences which connect together the points of emphasis, the slopes and hollows which lie between the crests of the waves, happen not to be interesting, and they are practically ignored by us—not indeed in intuition, but in review,

*

representation and description. We *think* as though the points of emphasis were alone the whole of experience. This thought, as we have seen, is practically useful. Without preferential regard or distributive attention, life, as we ordinarily live it, would be impossible. Hence the points of emphasis, the "crests" of the waves of presentation, may be called Pragmatic Facts, and they are, as before explained, Fact-sections.⁴

It will be observed, therefore, that the continuum is an inalienable datum of our life of experience—it is a fundamental posture, an original attitude of the Given. It is *not* obtained by the putting together of originally discrete factors by imagination; in other words, it is not a mental construct, a result of abstraction.

Now, continuity has never been derived in India, except by some forms of Buddhist thought. Continuity in its *veritable* sense will be studied in a later section. In the first place, there is the distinction between

⁴ See "Approaches to the Buddhist 'Patent Wonder'".

ontological continuity and epistemological continuity. The former is continuity pertaining to Reality, apart from, and independent of, experience. It raises this issue: Is Reality or forms of Reality continuous, whether or not we experience or think it as such? The latter is continuity pertaining to experience, and it raises the following two issues: (1) Is experience or forms of experience actually continuous? (2) Has our life of experience a *basis* or ground which is continuous, though conscious experience in itself may not be so? Keeping these two issues apart, herefore, we may have, in the second place, another distinction, *viz.*, that between psychological continuity and epistemological continuity. The former relates to experience as actually felt or intuited, the latter to what may be implied in experience, either as a condition. Now, keeping in mind these two distinctions, we may note that the Nyaya-Vaisheshika apparently recognises psychological continuity, but it definitely recognises the two other continuities. As regards ontological continuity of the fundamental Substances

(*Dravyas*) postulated by the First Standard are not only continuous, but infinitely continuous, which is the meaning of the term *Vibhu*. Each of the four entities, *Ākāśha*, *Kāla*, *Dik* and *Ātman*, is *Vibhu*. We need not discuss here the first three continuities, but refer only to the last. *Ātman*, which according to the First Standard is the basis or ground (*āshraya*) of experience, is an infinitely continuous substance. Though experiences themselves are discrete and transient, the spiritual ground which they inhere is a continuum. This fundamental basis or ground of experience always is and everywhere is. A given experience has *prāgabhāva* (i.e., non-existence before actual appearance or presentation) and *dhvangsābhāva* (i.e., non-existence at the moment from its origination); but it is everywhere whose experience it is and where it remains as a "permanent possibility" (in the words of J. S. Mill). The possibility of experience is always and everywhere. This conception of an all-pervasive continuum as the basis of experience is remarkable, and characteristic of orthodox Hindu thought.

to this thought, which is clearly in evidence in the Vedas, the Spirit, whatever its fundamental nature be, is an infinite *plenum*, akin to the Æther of Science, though purer and more perfect (as we shall see), whose individuality arises chiefly, if not solely, from the circumstance of its being associated with different Minds, Sensoria, etc., just as according to Science, the individuality of the physical atoms or corpuscles arises from the circumstance of the sea of ether being subdivided in different places to different forms of stress and strain.

Now for instance does, according to Science, the difference between an atom of Oxygen and an atom of Nitrogen arise? Both are believed to be made up of, and grounded in, the same stuff—ether. But while O is a stable stress-and-strain centre of a certain type in, and of, ether, N is a stress-and-strain centre of a different type. Owing to the difference in the disposition of *Shakti* in them, their properties apparently differ. These two points, brought into relief by the above, are worthy of note. *First*,
 5. On "Ether".

that assuming electricity to be, from the physical point of view, the fundamental mode of substance-energy (it is not a mere form of energy to-day), we are enabled to say not only that it exists where it appears to exist (as "free" electrons), but it exists, in a relatively static condition, even where it does not appear to exist, *i.e.*, in the so-called "neutral" atoms of O, N, etc. (as "bound" electrons).⁶ The basis of substance-energy in Matter (whether as Ether or as Electricity which is by some believed to be a condition of Ether) is thus ubiquitous. *Second*, as a corollary to the above we have this that in spite of all the difference between O and N and the rest, a slow process of evolutionary transmutation is noticeable in the material world by reason of which O, N and the rest are changing and evolving, though this universal process (symbolised by the Vedic Rishis *ás yajna* in many-places) may be especially noticeable in what are called the radio-active substances.⁷ This universal radio-activity is evidence not only of the unity of the fundamental physical

⁶ See "Matter".

⁷ *Ibid.*

basis of Matter as substance-energy, but of the unity of the *law* of material being.

Now, this fundamental unity as regards substance, energy and law in the material world will serve not only as an analogy but an illustration of the fundamental unity in the world of experience. Life, Mind and Spirit are on a higher plane, and on a more comprehensive scale, what Ether and Electricity are, according to Science, on a lower plane and on a comparatively restricted scale. In other words, as we shall presently see, Life, Mind and Spirit are the ascending orders of a series of continua of which Ether and Electricity are comparatively lower orders. The Ātman as Spirit is thus the Perfect Ether—*Ether in the limit*. Ultimately it is, as the Vedānta says, the *Chidākāsha*. The Chhāndogya Upanishad makes it *jyāyān* (the highest) and *parāyana* (the ultimate ground). It is the Immense—*Brahman*. It, therefore, underlies, and manifests as, Time, Space, Life, Cosmic Mind, Physical Ether, and in fact, as all other continua. It is its pervasive presence which makes anything appear as a continuum. To withdraw it is to withdraw the basis of

continuity—nay, the basis of existence. This spiritual basis of continuity and existence in its purer forms (*viz.*, as *Chit*) will be studied in a special volume of this Series, but here we may note the point which is especially pertinent to the present discussion. It is this: All the three standards of Hindu Philosophy definitely recognise this spiritual basis of continuity, though its *nature* is seen with increasing purity and clearness as we gradually mount up from the First to the Third Standard.

It is thus remarkable that even the First Standard which, generally speaking, reviews the world from a commonsense and pragmatic standpoint, makes the spiritual basis of experience (*Ātman*) *vibhu*, *i.e.*, a limitless continuum. It thus makes *Ātman* similar to what Ether is to Science. As in Science the basis of Matter and the possibility of its physical or concrete manifestation is given everywhere, so according to the First Standard, the basis and possibility of experience is given everywhere. Far from making the *Ātman*, as some of the Cartesian philosophers did, the special proprium of man, Hindu thought, in all its stages, recognises it, as latent or patent, in *all* things and

in *all* places. But then, as we have pointed out, the standpoint of the First Standard is pragmatic, and we accordingly find it stopping short of the last limit to which the theory of continuity can be consistently pushed. The First Standard is, generally speaking, the first approximation, the first approach to Truth. We have, therefore, the following limitations or reservations left with regard to *Ātman* or the spiritual basis of experience. (1) Though *vibhu*, it is limited by the independent existence of other *vibhus* (or infinite continua), *viz.*, *Ākāsha*, *Kāla* and *Dik* (though in some branches of Neo-Logic there have been attempts to reduce to a common denominator which is *Īshvara* or *Paramātmān*). (2) It is limited by the independent existence of a Chief *Ātman* (somewhat like the Arch-monad of Leibnitz). (3) It is limited by its own plurality, that is, by the fact that Spirits are many. (4) And as regards functioning, it is limited by the circumstance of its having to depend upon inner and outer instruments (*antarindriya* and *vāhyendriya*). and objective material in order to rise to a life of conscious experience.⁸

⁸ See "Reality" and "Mind".

Hence though it is the basis and possibility of experience, it has to depend on the co-operation of other factors for the purpose of getting actual, conscious experience. It is only the Supreme Spirit and the knowledge (*jñāna*), etc., is *nitya* (permanent). All these limitations or reservations are made, as we shall see in the volume on *Chait*, on pragmatic considerations, as approximations or approaches to Truth. Closer approximations or nearer approaches are made by the two higher Standards, until at last the supreme experience the Fact is recognised as the *Pūrṇa* (Whole) itself of which the *Śruti* paradoxically says : Even if *Pūrṇa* be subtracted from *Pūrṇa*, *Pūrṇa* remains.

Reverting, however, to the classification of continuity given before, we now see that the First Standard definitely recognises both ontological continuity and epistemological continuity. It recognises the latter inasmuch as, according to it, the spiritual basis of experience (*i.e.*, what is presupposed and implied in experience) is *vibhu*. But on account of the working of the atomic Mind, Sensoria, *sangskāras*, etc., the actual experiences are,

from the dynamic standpoint of this standard, discrete, instant, serial, and not continuous.⁹ There is thus no psychological continuity.

Thus while the continuity of the spiritual basis of experience may be guaranteed by the experience of the Seers (Revelation), or may be *inferred* from the data given in our own experience, the First Standard is not prepared to say that our conscious experience itself directly gives us sufficient warrant for believing in such continuity. In actual feeling, we have a manifold, a series only, as the older generation of Empiricists would say. There is no immediate apprehension, no intuition, of continuity in our mental life. This, however, is, according to our showing, ignorance or veiling of the Given—the Fact. Such ignorance is practically useful: hence, commonly, we all thus ignore, select and emphasise. The Second Standard rends this veil of ignorance. It shows that the spiritual basis of experience and consciousness of which experiences are modes are not two, but one. In other words, consciousness or *Chit* itself is the spiritual basis of experience. If therefore that basis be

⁹ See "Reality" and "Mind".

continuous we must have an immediate feeling or intuition of it. That feeling or intuition may be, for practical reasons, obscured in our ordinary mental life, but it can never be altogether effaced, since the very essence of the life of experience is consciousness. Particular experiences may cast their "reflections" on *Purusha* (or *Chit*), just as fleeting clouds may cast their shadows on the surface of a lake; but as in the one case, so in the other, the "reflections," though themselves varied, discrete and fleeting, do not make that which supports or reflects them (*i.e.*, *Chit*) itself so. *Purusha* indeed owns those reflections, and they *appear* also as his own; but really he abides undiminished and unconditioned, while they come and go. It is the recognition of this felt or psychological continuity over and above the two other forms of continuity which makes *Sāṅghya-yoga* a standard of closer approximation than *Nyāya-Vaisheshika*. But even this view is, as we have seen in the preceding volumes, circumscribed by pragmatic considerations. The continuity of the Spirit is still limited, firstly, by the fact that the number is plural, and secondly, by the fact that there is

maintained a material or objective Principle of experience independent of Consciousness, which is *Prakriti*. According to our nomenclature, therefore, the Sāṅkhyan *Purusha* like the Vaisheshika *Ātman* is still a Fact-section, a Pragmatic Fact.

The Fact is not reached till we come to the Vedāntic idea of *Brahman*—the Immense and Whole in which everything is grounded and out of which everything is evolved. And what is this Immense, this Whole? It is Experience when we take it without ignorance, and therefore, without any limitations or reservations. It is the recognition of what we are, and can never cease to be, except through ignorance or veiling of our complete Being.¹⁰ It is certainly alogical being, the uncircumscribed intuition of life; but at the first effort of analysis, it presents two aspects to our thought, *viz.*, a quiescent or static Being-aspect and a stressing or dynamic Becoming-aspect: the aspect of *Chit* or Consciousness as the ground and manifest, and the aspect of *Shakti* or Power of Consciousness to ignore, veil,

¹⁰ See "Approaches to Truth" and "Patent Wonder" where the Doctrine of Fact is elaborated.

circumscribe and variously evolve itself. In the Shākta view, the former is *Shiva* and the latter is *Shakti*, and they are in reality one, or rather, the Fact which they compose is an alogical Whole which in its perfectness is not expressible in terms of any logical category. This Whole is the perfection, "limit" and basis of all our continua, Time, Space, Ether, and so forth. And whatever may be said of Time, Space, etc., this alogical Whole is no *theory*; it is the Fact.

The well-known *Eko'hang bahu syāṅg prajāyeya* which describes the creative ideation of *Brahman*, clearly involves this idea of the Power of Consciousness or Consciousness as Power to evolve as the infinitely varied world of experience. The fundamental condition of undefined, uncircumscribed and, therefore, alogical Being-experience is one of wonder¹¹ and almost one of awe.¹² In the Rig-veda

¹¹ Kathopanishad and Gītā (Ashcharyyavat pashyati kashchidenang, etc.).

¹² Brihadāranyaka, where the experience of unity or singleness is spoken of *as if* it were an experience of fear. The idea is—the Primordial One multiplies itself because it seems as if it were afraid of its own singleness.

itself the Fact is spoken of in many places as *Aditi* (lit. that which is not segmented ; therefore, the Entire, the Whole). She is the mother of the gods, and particularly of *Dyauh* and *Prithivī* (loosely translated as Heaven and Earth). As *Aditi* means the Entire, the Whole, so *Diti* means the section, the part. In the Rig-veda itself we have unmistakeable evidence (as we shall see) to show that in the intuition of the Vedic seers *Aditi* was no other than what we have known as the Fact, so that *Diti*, her opposite, is the Fact-section. The former is the Fact accepted and manifested ; the latter is the Fact ignored and veiled.

Aditi, therefore, is the vedic equivalent of what we have so long been speaking of as the continuum in the limit or Perfect Continuum. In Chhândogya-Brâhmana it is *Ākāsha*, *jyāyān* and *parāyanam*. In many of the Upanishads it appears as *Brahman* or *Ātman* ; sometimes as *Prāna*. In the Rig-veda itself, Indra, Varuna, Soma, Agni, Vishvakarmā, etc., are apparently dealt with as separate Devatās, but looking narrowly into the matter one cannot fail to perceive that beneath all this appearance of

multiplicity, there runs not only a connecting thread of harmony and kinship, but one of unity. In other words, viewed from the deeper standpoint, the vedic gods certainly present the aspect of a unitary system. Indra, Soma, Agni and the rest each, in the ultimate sense, means the Perfect Continuum which is also Perfect Experience. It is not fair to say that such meaning or such metaphysics can possibly be *read* into the Vedas by us (and were in fact read into them by Sāyana and other commentators in many places), but that probably the vedic seers themselves had little or no suspicion of that meaning or that metaphysics; and that their minds had hardly yet been elevated above the level of natural animism, spiritism, etc., which represents the infancy of the human mind in every age and country.

To the penetrating and discerning eye, the vedic literature offers three stages or planes of interpretation, and these planes of understanding and interpretation were, as we shall see in another volume of the present Series, not foreign to the minds of the vedic Rishis. In other words, there is ample internal

evidence in the vedic literature itself to warrant the hypothesis that such lines of interpretation, instead of being later interpolations, were actually known and pursued by those who were first responsible for the vedic hymns. It is true that in the *Samhitā* portion of the vedas, these lines are not clearly indicated, and that for a clear differentiation of these lines one must look into such Upanishads as the *Bṛihadāraṇyaka*, *Chhāndogya*, etc., which mark the natural disengagement of thought from the ritualistic side of the vedas (*Karma kāṇḍa*), and its rise to the philosophy of life and its values and their realisation (*Jñānakāṇḍa*). But though not very clearly set forth, these lines or planes are unmistakeably given in the Vedas—as progressively higher standpoints of understanding, realising and representing the subject-matter. These standpoints which, as we have said, are definitely adopted in the Upanishads (in such matters as the *Udgītha*, *Yajna*, etc.), appear also to be adopted, though not quite so explicitly, in the *Samhitā* portion of the Vedas, in the understanding and representation of such matters as the nature of

Indra, Aditi, Soma, Agni, Yajna, etc. The standpoints are: *Ādhyātmika*, *Ādhidaivika* and *Ādhibhautika*. The first interprets in terms of Experience or Consciousness; the second interprets in terms of forms of Consciousness-Power (*Chit-Shakti*) objectively treated; the third interprets in terms of objective things in which *Chit* is apparently veiled. The first is psychological; the second is psychophysical; and the last is physical. The first gives us *Chaitanya*; the second a *Devatā*; the third what appears to us a *jada*.

Now, Aditi, Indra, Agni, Soma, etc., have all been thought of and represented on these three lines. Aditi, for example, is according to the first standpoint, Perfect and seamless Experience which we have called the Fact. There is intrinsic evidence in the Vedas themselves to show that Aditi was actually so thought of by the Rishis.¹³ According to the second standpoint, she is the primordial manifestation of *Chit-Shakti* as Mother-Power in whose womb all forms of *Chit-Shakti*

¹³ For a full discussion of the subject see Professor P. N. Mukhyopādhyāya's Lectures on Veda and Vijnāna (in Bengali).

(called *Devatās*) are born.¹⁴ In the evolution of the world, the manifestations of the forms of *Chit-Shakti* (i.e., forms of Consciousness working as agents) constitute an hierarchy of genera and species, of which the highest order or *summum genus* is Aditi (the undivided). She is therefore the most generic form of *Chit-Shakti*, as according to Mantra-Shāstra, the mantra *Om* is the most generic form of *shabda*.¹⁵ From the third or physical standpoint, she is a subtle, continuous *plenum* (roughly analogous to Ether) in which the physical universe "lives, moves and has its being". In each case, be it observed, she stands for a continuum: as meaning that which is not divided, she represents the idea of continuity in each case. In each case again she presents the Mother-aspect. In the first, she is the Mother-Experience or Fact out of which all particularised experiences or Fact-sections are elaborated. In the second, she is the Mother-*Chit-Shakti* or *Devatā* which represents the original, conscious "vital impetus" which is the Root of all the varied forms of conscious

¹⁴ The matter will be dealt with in another volume.

¹⁵ See "Garland of Letters".

vital impetuses or urges in the world. Not only *Dyauh* and *Prithivī*, but *Indra*, *Agni*, *Vāyu* and the rest are her progeny; each is a special form of Consciousness working as an impetus in the world; if we generalise these specific forms, or take their generic character, we have the original or Mother-form which is *Aditi*. In the third, she is the Mother-stuff (call it Ether or Electricity or Protyle) in which the “atoms” and “elements” of Matter originate as strain-centres or centres of discontinuity.¹⁶

Not only *Aditi*, but *Indra* and the rest have been understood and represented in the Vedas on the three lines before explained. And what is more important and more pertinent to our present purpose is this that each *Devatā* has been dealt with specifically as well as generically from the three standpoints. Generically treated, each *Devatā*=*Aditi*=the Continuum in the limit: the progeny are thus reabsorbed in the Mother-Power; the Fact-sections in the Fact.¹⁷

¹⁶ See the volume of “Matter”.

¹⁷ See “Serpent Power” for the Tāntric *Bhūta-Shuddhi*.

These then are the cardinal principles of vedic (or shāstric) interpretation : (a) the subject-matter is dealt with according to the three lines or on the three planes before explained ; (b) each matter is dealt with generically as well as specifically, so that the vedic treatment of it yields a series in the ascending and descending order ; and (c) the vedas often take the superior " limit " of the series (*charamotkarsha* or *paramotkarsha*), and thus reduce the specifically different matters (such as Indra, Agni etc.) to fundamental identity. If, therefore, in our vedic (or shāstric) studies we lose these clues, we shall soon find ourselves lost (as many orientalisks have been) in a jungle where there is no track leading to a system ; and which abounds with dangerous pitfalls of hopelessly obscure paradoxes, difficult tangles and flagrant contradictions. In Rig-veda, X. 72, for example, we have the genesis of the Devatās. In that *Sūkta*, we have the following paradox : Prajāpati Daksha is born of Aditi and Aditi is born of Prajāpati Daksha. Aditi is thus the mother as well as the daughter of Prajāpati. What can this mean ? Rig. I. 69. 1. (" *Pari-prajātah*, etc.), for example again, says that

Agni, though he is the son of the Devas, is also their father. What is this? Rig. I. 95. 4 also speaks of Agni in a similar strain: Agni, though son he be, has given birth to his mothers.¹⁸ And there are similar paradoxes regarding Indra and the rest. The Rishis used to record their experiences in a species of shorthand which we cannot hope to be able to decipher unless we carefully follow the clues above explained. We need not here attempt an explanation of these and many other paradoxes,¹⁹ but may simply observe this that Aditi who is represented as the mother of the Devas cannot obviously be taken in the same sense as Aditi who is the daughter. So about Agni, Indra and the rest. In the light of the principles before explained, it will be readily perceived that Aditi, Agni, etc., are not conceived *rigidly* in the vedas, but that each constitutes a series with a superior and an inferior limit spread over the three planes referred to before. Thus reviewed Aditi as Mother=Charamā or Paramā Aditi or Aditi (Continuum) in the superior limit=Indra

¹⁸ "Vatsah Mātrī janayata, etc."

¹⁹ See "Veda and Vijnāna".

= Agni taken in the superior limit. In the superior limit all specific or divergent manifestations (whether as Chaitanya, or as Devatā or as Bhūta) converge and meet in fundamental, undivided unity which is the Fact. Aditi as daughter is obviously a lower continuum or a continuum in the descending order of the continua-series. Suppose now Aditi as Mother = the Perfect Continuum of Experience, the alogical Fact; Prajāpati = Experience in which the Self has differentiated itself as the Subject and makes an object of that Experience, and wills to evolve that Experience into mutually distinguishable Fact-sections (the stage of the Prajāpati is itself a Fact-section as compared with the Fundamental Given which is alogical); Aditi as daughter = experience evolved and conditioned as Ākāsha (or any other lower continuum) by the creative volition of Prajāpati. This is a solution of the paradox from the *ādhyātmika* or psychological standpoint. And it can be justly claimed that this solution is not simply *read* into the Vedas by later commentators or by ourselves.

Similarly, Āgni, Indra, Vāyu and others in their ultimate sense stand for the Perfect

Continuum. And there can be little doubt that they *were* taken in their ultimate sense (as well as in their relative senses) by the vedic Rishis. In many places, Agni stands for ordinary fire or heat, though with respect to this also many hymns assert that it is universally present, both as latent and as patent.²⁰ There are many epithets applied to Agni which are quite applicable to what is ordinarily sensed by us as fire or heat. There are other epithets which can be applicable only to something universally existent—latently even in water—which is indestructible²¹ and eternal. Some *Riks* make it unmeasured;²² others make it immutable;²³ others again make it great or a continuum.²⁴ It is true that in some *Riks* Agni is described as the son of Force or Energy, *Vala*²⁵ or Shakti; but there are others which clearly identify Agni with *Ātman* or *Brahman*;²⁶ and there are a few

²⁰ Rig., I. 68. 1; I. 59; I. 95. 4; I. 65. 5, etc.

²¹ Rig., I. 26. 9.

²² Rig., I. 27. 11.

²³ Rig., I. 73. 2.

²⁴ Rig., I. 59; I. 68. 1, etc.

²⁵ Rig., I. 45. 9; I. 26. 10; I. 27. 2.

²⁶ Rig., I. 18. 7.

which are understandable only if Agni be regarded as a form of *Chit-Shakti*, the epithets used being *vidvān*,²⁷ *vedhasah*,²⁸ etc. On the whole, if we carefully study Agni throughout the vedas, the conclusion seems to be irresistible, *viz.*, that the vedic Rishis realised Agni on all the three planes explained before and dealt with it generically as well as specifically—that is, as a continua-series with a superior and an inferior limit. Ultimately, Agni like Aditi is treated as the Primary Root and Basis of all Becoming.²⁹

The vedic cosmogony starts, as we have seen, with a continuum which is commonly described as a sort of cosmic fluid.³⁰ Rig., X. III. 8, asks: Where does this Water begin? Where is its middle? And where is its end? Evidently, therefore, it is a boundless *plenum* symbolised as Water which again in later shāstric works appears as *kārana-salila* (the causal fluid). Rig., X. 82. 1 shows that what is first created by *Vishvakarmā* is a continuous

²⁷ Rig., X. 1. 3.

²⁸ Rig., I. 72. 1, etc.

²⁹ Rig., X. 5. 7.

³⁰ Rig., X. 82. 1; Rig., X. 190, etc.

cosmic substance not yet finitised into a granular structure. Rig., X. 72. 6 definitely, though metaphorically, outlines the process by which granules or centres of strain appear in the continuous cosmic stuff. It tells us how the Devatas begin to dance in the cosmic all-pervasive Water ; and how grains or particles (symbolised as dust) are formed by the dance of the gods. This important vedic parable is traceable in some of the other so-called mythologies of the world, and it represents a fundamental law of creative evolution. It shows the birth of centres of stress-and-strain in an otherwise placid and homogeneous cosmic substance ; the birth of the "cosmic dust" from the "cosmic fluid". Almost all philosophic systems and almost all physical theories which have ever ventured into metaphysics have had to deal with this fundamental riddle, *viz.*, how discontinuities first appear in the midst of continuity, heterogeneity evolves out of homogeneity. Modern Physics too is faced with this riddle. If, for instance, we take the Ether of Physical Science as the approximate equivalent on the physical plane of what

is spoken of in the vedic parable as the Mother Fluid, then physicists are called upon, supposing they care to go to the very root of the matter, to explain how the Prime Atoms or Electrons or Centres of Intrinsic strain appear in a continuous Ether. And there appears to be a fundamental truth in the hypothesis of Lord Kelvin and others that, if Ether be something akin to a Perfect Fluid, vortex motion cannot be imparted to Ether in different centres except by a miracle, that is to say, by the action of an extra-physical agency.³¹ Now, this extra-physical agency is, according to Indian conception, *Chit-Shakti* which, in various forms, appears in the vedas as the Devatās or gods. The dance of the gods, therefore, means the action of the Forms of *Chit-Shakti* upon the primordial and continuous cosmic stuff, by which action "dusts" appear meaning 'discontinuities or centres of strain (gyrostatic or otherwise).

Practically the same truth is expressed in somewhat different terms by the *Manu-samhitā* which opens with a cosmogony.

³¹ See "Matter".

Here too the primordial cosmic substance is symbolised as *Āp* or Water (which is peculiarly apt to express a condition of mobile continuity). In this Water the Creator casts His seed.³²

This of course means two things: (1) the fundamental action of *Chit-Shakti* upon the given Datum of cosmic Matter; (2) by that action the cosmic Matter becomes, so to say, impregnated, that is, informed with *Chit-Shakti*, instinct with Consciousness-Power. This is quite in consonance with the vedāntic doctrine that there is no evolution of *Prakṛiti* or Cosmic Matter except by and through the action of *Chit* as Power.³³ In the Tantras this is spoken of as the co-operation of *Shiva* as Efficient Cause and *Shakti* as Material Cause in the creation of the world. By the action of *Chit-Shakti* the Mother Stuff (symbolised as *Āpah* or Waters) contains the seed, that is, potency of the Creator, and thus becomes the possibility of evolution as the world. This condition of potentiality or possibility as spoken of as the cosmic Egg or Ovum

³² *Tāsu Vijamavākshipat.*

³³ See Vedānta, particularly the Sūtras, *Īkshater-nāshabdām*, and *Rachanānupapatternānumānam*.

(*Brahmānda*). It should be noted in this connection that in the vedas themselves *Agni* is frequently described as being born in the womb of water and also as impregnating water—a symbol which on the physical plane means³⁴ the presence of *Agni* as Latent Heat in water (and not only in water but in all *Bhūtas*—*Sarva-bhūteshu nigūrhah*), and the formation of rain-drops by *Agni* acting as electric corpuscles or Electrons as centres of condensation (a modern scientific truth founded upon experimental evidence and quite well-known to the vedic seers³⁵). On a higher plane, however, *Agni* means *Chit-Shakti* and *Aṣṭ Māyā-Shakti*, and we have seen how the latter becomes instinct with the former, and how this is essential to creative evolution.

The fact ultimately is experience, and we may observe that this vedic cosmogony seems to be well grounded in experience as we actually have it. We have direct knowledge of causal efficiency when by a volition we set in motion matter in the motor centres of the brain. We

³⁴ See "Veda O Vijnāna".

³⁵ See "Veda O Vijnāna".

as forms of *Chit-Shakti* do upon the matter in the brain what in the vedic parable the gods are supposed to have done upon the primordial cosmic stuff or Water. As Indra assisted by the Maruts is supposed in another familiar vedic parable to have released the cows shut up in the caves by Pani,³⁶ so every Centre of Consciousness (*e.g.*, I) releases by its activity power latent in matter. When again the *Manusamhitā* speaks of the dichotomous division of the Cosmic Ovum, and says that the upper half becomes *Dyauh* while the lower becomes *Prithivī*, and the intervening space *Antāriksha*, it draws upon a vedic source. Rig., X. 82. 1 tells us how Vishvakarmā first creates a continuum in which *Dyāvā-Prithivī* are still indistinguishable from each other; then afterwards, they become separate and distinguishable from each other. *Dyāvā-Prithivī* are crudely interpreted to mean Heaven and Earth respectively; but there seems to exist enough internal evidence in the vedas themselves to show that they were not so crudely understood by the seers, but that they,

³⁶ Rig., I. 6. 5 and X. 108.

like every other matter, were understood in the three planes we have explained before.³⁷ *Dyāvā-Prithivī* is the symbol or short-hand description for any condition of existence which has become polarised, that is, which presents two opposite poles (*e.g.*, the positive and negative poles in Electro-magnetics). The polarised substance may be immense (*mahat*) or small (*anu*). For example, when two unit charges of electricity of opposite kind (called corpuscles or electrons in Science, particularly the negative ones) dissociate from each other and creates by their stresses a gap between them, we have the truth of the vedic parable about *Dyāvā-Prithivī* illustrated on the physical plane. The mutually associated condition of existence is neutral condition—*Dyauh* and *Prithivī* rolled together into one, so to say. There is then no *antarīksha* (inter-space) between them. They are indistinguishable: there is no manifested polarity. For polarity to actually manifest itself, each must dissociate itself from the other. And unless poles manifest themselves, there is no manifestation of

³⁷ See "Veda O Vijnāna".

kinetic energy, and therefore no work done. Hence the dichotomy of *Dyāvā-Prithivī* is essential to creative evolution. In the psychological plane, this means the polarity of Subject-Object, *Aham-Idam*, and our experience evolves precisely upon the appearance of this polarity.³⁸ In the evolution of living beings too appearance of polarity (whether in the shape of sexes or not) seems to be essential. This fundamental fact is symbolised by the parable of *Dyāvā-Prithivī*.

The Primary Basis of evolution (*i.e.*, from and upon which evolution starts) is, like the Primary Basis of our experience, alogical, indefinable, inscrutable. This is variously described in the vedas as *Asat*,³⁹ *Rātri*,⁴⁰ etc. The Manusamhitā describes it as *Tamobhūtā*, and gives it such adjectives as *aprajnāta* (unknown), *alakshana* (indefinable), *aprataṛkya* (inscrutable, unthinkable). This *tamas*, however, is not darkness; it is a condition of being of which though we may have intuition, we cannot have any thought, any logical judgment.

³⁸ See "Approaches to Truth".

³⁹ Rig., X. 72. 3—4.

⁴⁰ Rig., X. 190.

The approximate equivalent of this in our mental life is *sushupti* or dreamless sleep. Rig., X. 72. 3—4 speak of the birth of *Diks* or Directions. This is important as it shows that the Primary Continuum from and out of which evolution proceeds, is an undirected, “scalar” condition of existence—one in which “lines” of force or tendencies to manifestation have not yet appeared. In the Mantra-shāstra, the undirected, massive condition of Power which precedes creative energising in definite directions, is called *Nāda*.⁴¹

To sum up: The Continuum has been understood in the vedas in what the Chhāndogya calls *Parovarīyān* fashion; the result is that we have a series of continua, the superior limit of which is *Chit*, which is in the vedānta the Primary or Absolute Continuum (*Ātman* or *Brahman*); what are pragmatically regarded by us as continua such as Ether, Air, Water and so forth, are only relatively so. It is important to bear in mind the distinction between Primary Aditi and Secondary Aditi, between Secondary Aditi and Tertiary Aditi, and so on. Otherwise the Shāstra will appear, as it has in

⁴¹ See “Garland of Letters”.

fact appeared to many, as a jungle in which there is no path.

§ 3

In the preceding long section we have dealt with the meaning of continuity, its presentation in the Shāstra (and particularly in the vedas), and its psychological basis. In the remaining few pages we shall attempt to give only a synopsis of the subject-matter which, as regards some points or aspects, has already been discussed in the preceding volumes of the present Series, and which, as regards other points or aspects, will be discussed in some of the forthcoming volumes. Now, we have seen that we have sufficient warrant for the idea of continuity in our normal experience which is a universe in fact, but is veiled or ignored, and thereby reduced, for pragmatic reasons. The veil makes us take things by their contraries. Thus what is in fact a boundless *plenum* is practically accepted by us a tiny "fact" of experience, *e.g.*, as a particular sound or colour, a particular feeling or idea. The real "Fact" is supposed by us to be an "abstraction" or a mental construct; while the pragmatic

“fact-section” which in reality is abstract is taken as the “Fact”. Thus sensation appears to be more real and more original than perception. It is therefore necessary for us to be able to lift the veil in order to have a full and complete view of Experience as it is. This is *Vidyā* which is opposed to *Avidyā* (ignorance). The lifting of the veil, and the consequent realisation of Experience as it is, is the work of *Sādhana*. Evidence of continuity, though not lacking in ordinary life, is thus supplied by *Yoga*.

In what is called *Kundalinī Yoga* or *Bhūta-shuddhi*, there is effected a progressive absorption of all limited and discrete forms of experience (*i.e.*, fact-sections) into the Primary Continuum which is *Shiva-Shakti* united together. It is the merging of the finite into the Infinite, of the part into the Whole, of the measurable and thinkable into the Immeasurable and Unthinkable. This is the realisation of *So'ham*. Then again, starting from this, the limited forms of experience are progressively evolved and in the reverse order (as compared with the order of absorption).⁴²

⁴² See “Serpent Power”.

Yoga establishes the continuity of experience (a) as regards extensity, and (b) as regards protensity or duration. In *Samādhi* it reveals the *Chidākāsha* which is Chit manifested as extensity. It also shows the continuity of mental life (the nexus between actual presentations and possible presentations or *Saṅskāras*), by lighting up subliminal consciousness. It traces the complete and apparently infinite curve of mental life not only by showing how actual presentations persist in subtle forms when they sink below the threshold of consciousness, but also by tracing the curve out through previous cycles of birth.⁴³ It therefore shows that there is no void in *Chit*, and interruption in the flow of experience. Further, it is able to show that the life-cycle of the world itself is continuous not only in this sense that it has no absolute beginning and end, but in this also that the cycle of the life-history of the world continually repeats itself, as regards the Types at least, if not as regards their detailed manifestation. This gives us continuity

⁴³ A future volume of the Series will especially deal with this.

of the World Form, and of the Law of its evolution.

§ 4

In "Matter" the physical basis of Continuity has been discussed. There reference was made to the search after the limit of the Continua-series and after that of the Discontinua-series made in Science. Search in one direction has now brought us up to Ether, and in the other, down to the Electron. But as we have seen neither the scientific Ether nor the Electron can be taken as the limiting position. It is just possible that the Science of to-morrow will push beyond both. But in any case the need of "points" of charge or centres of stress-and-strain, and of a continuous medium (whatever that turns out to be) somehow linking them up, will remain. Particular *forms* of Ethers and Charges may be given up as being not fundamental; but Ether *as* Continuum, and Charge *as* Point of stimulation must abide. All the three standards of Hindu Philosophy recognise this and retain both, though in different forms. (1) The First Standard has *Ākāsha*, *Kāla* and *Dik*

(over and above *Ātmā*) on the continua side, and *Parmānus* (as Points of stimulation) on the other side. (2) In the Second, *Pradhāna* (*Prakriti*) and *Mahat* stand on the continua side, while by the action of the Centre-making Principle (*Asmitā*), *Tanmātras* evolve out of the continua and work them out into discontinuities. (3) In the Third, *Chit* as the Primary Continuum progressively finitises itself by its own Power, and discontinuities appear as the result of this veiling and limiting operation. The Mantra-Shāstra contemplates the attitudes of Power as *Nāda* and as *Bindu*. The Physical Continua—Space, Ether and the rest—evolve out of this self-veiling and self-limiting and self-determining operation of Consciousness as Power. So do Cosmic Mind and Cosmic Life (*i.e.*, *Manas* and *Prāna* as universal, pervading all existence as latent or as patent).

As was pointed out in "Matter," the tendency of modern Science is to treat the one-time constant *mass* of Matter as a function of Energy, so that the physical units of Matter (Atoms, Electrons, etc.), are no longer regarded as absolutely persistent. Continuity of Matter in that sense therefore no longer holds.

Matter can be annihilated and also perhaps created. When annihilated it liberates an enormous quantity of stored up and "bound" (one could say, *Kundālākṛiti*) energy which is the essence of Matter; it is created when *Shakti* becomes in a given manner "bound" about a nucleus or centre. When again one kind of Matter (Hydrogen) changes into another kind (Helium), we see this transference of Mass into Energy illustrated. The First Standard, it is true, lays down the indestructibility of the *Paramānus*, but the Second makes *Prakṛiti* alone indestructible into which *Tanmātras* and the rest may be reabsorbed as they are evolved out of her. The Derivatives too are persistent, if we take into consideration their patent as well as latent conditions. In the latent condition, each Derivative becomes assimilated into its immediate Root or Cause. The Third Standard asserts absolute continuity in its *Chit* working as Power (*Shakti*).

§ 5

We may briefly note also continuity in Life. Hindu thought has recognised the continuity

of Life not in the crude sense in which Biogenesis holds the view that the germs of life have not been evolved by “non-living” matter, but in the deeper sense (now corroborated by the researches of Sir Jagadīsha Bose) that Life is latent in all being, since it is the one primordial *Chit-Substance* which by its own Power appears as Mind, as Life and as Matter. “*Ekam sad viprā bahudhā vadanti*”—as the Veda says. In fact, the Upanishads study the *Prāna* in the *Parovariyān* fashion, noticing different strata. *Prāna* may mean “breath”; it may mean “vital air” or “nerve energy”; it may mean *Hiranyagarbha* or Cosmic Life and Mind (*i.e.*, the substratum and synthesis of all forms of life and mind in the universe); and finally it means *Brahman* or the Immense itself. The last underlies all existence, since it is and manifests as all existence. So that there is no “non-living” matter—nothing in which there is not life. Hindu thought maintains further (1) continuity of the Types (*Ākṛiti*), including the Types of living being. These Types may be, however, either latent or patent in a given age or locality. The Type

Homo for example is persistent, though in a particular cycle of world-operations, it might have appeared as patent after certain geological strata had been formed and certain other anthropoid types had appeared.⁴⁴ It maintains too (2) that the process of evolution (with reversions and retrogressions) of living beings is an infinite curve line without beginning and without end. This curve is *Sangsriti*, and is traced out on the map of infinite Time and Space in accordance with the Law of *Karma*. It maintains also (3) continuity in the life of the world in rhythm (creation and dissolution being compared to exhalation and inhalation of the Divine Mother—diastole and systole of the Cosmic Heart); in heredity; in tradition; and so on.

On the whole we may say this: The world starting from a common Root has, or appears to have, three divergent (and yet parallel) manifestations—as *Artha* (Object), *Pratyaya* (Thought) and *Shabda* (Name). Now, the Hindu position is this that each line is

⁴⁴ The matter will be discussed in a future volume especially dealing with creative evolution.

continuous, starting from the Origin and going back to the Origin again.⁴⁵

§ 6

Continuity may be regarded in different forms. Some have been discussed by us in a previous section. 'We propose another scheme here. In the first place, continuity may be of Substance or of Form, or of both. The substance of a Thing remains but its form varies ; or its form remains but substance varies ; or both the substance and form remain. Continuity of Substance may be of two kinds : continuity of stuff or Matter, and continuity of Energy. Continuity of Form may also be of two kinds : continuity of Types and continuity of Laws.

§ 7

Now, Stuff or Matter in the universe appears in the four forms: Spirit, Mind, Life, Matter (*Bhūta*). We know that the Highest Standard regards these four as *essentially* one. Hence the stuff of the world is continuous (*a*) as regards

⁴⁵ See "Garland of Letters".

essence, and (b) as regards evolution and involution (from one to another).⁴⁶ In Nature there is no vacuum, no missing links. As regards Energy, it is maintained to be fundamentally *Chit-Shakti*; and though therefore transformation and correlation of the various forms of Energy are allowed, Vedānta is not prepared to circumscribe *Shakti* itself which is immeasurable, so that we cannot say that its sum-total always remains constant. Conservation of Energy in that sense is therefore only approximately and pragmatically true.⁴⁷ It follows also that energy which is fundamentally of the same nature operates in different planes—spiritual, vital and physical. It may be there as Static and as Kinetic. Absolutely static form of Energy (the limit of quiescence) is *Chidākāsha* which is *Shiva*. What ordinarily passes for static or potential Energy is really subtle Kinetic Energy. The definition of the former as Energy of Position and that of the latter as Energy of Motion are only pragmatic definitions. Now, operative Energy may be

⁴⁶ See "Reality".

⁴⁷ Hence the stock of energy is not a closed curve; see the account in "Matter".

pragmatically analysed with respect to two co-ordinates: Succession, Co-existence. The former again may be variable and conditional or invariable and unconditional. If invariable and unconditional, it makes Causation, or Causal Operation. Power as *Kāla* moves things in succession; Power as *Dik* holds them in their relative positions; Power as Cause produces phenomena. Whilst the First Standard makes the first two Powers separate entities (*viz.*, *Kāla* and *Dik*) and reduces causation to invariable and unconditional succession of one phenomena upon another in which the former was non-existent (*Prāga-bhāva*), the Highest Standard, as we have seen, makes ultimately *Kāla*=*Dik*=Consciousness as Power; and in both Sāmkhya and Vedānta, Cause=Effect (each completely considered), as regards substance and energy, the only difference being the configuration or collocation of substance-energy in the latter which is not apparent in the former.⁴⁸ In Vedāntic parlance, it is merely the difference of *Nāma*, and we might add, of apparent *Rūpa*.

⁴⁸ See "Causality".

As regards Formal Continuity we have noticed two modes: the continuity of Types and continuity of Laws. The world is a cycle of operations which completes itself in a time which is technically called *Kalpa*. During the life-time of this cycle, Types and their variations down to mere particulars appear: Types of *Artha*, *Pratyaya* and *Shabda*. Now, it is a common position of Hindu thought that the cycle of operations in one *Mahākalpa* repeats itself, at least as regards the Types, in another *Mahākalpa* (hence it is called *cycle*), and that as a *Pravāha* or flow it is infinitely continuous (*anādi* and *ananta*). The question whether the particulars or details also reappear is a difficult one, and there seems to exist some ground for holding that the world-movement is *spiraline* (which combines upward motion with rotatory motion), instead of being merely rotatory, with the result that there is progress in spite of the persistence and repetition of the Typal Forms.⁴⁹ Types again may range from the *summum genus* to the *infima species*, in the three fields of *Artha*, *Pratyaya* and *Shabda*. Hence we have orders or Hierarchies. For

⁴⁹ To be dealt with hereafter.

example, on the cosmic plane we have the hierarchy of *Īshvara*, *Hiranyagarbha* and *Virāt*, and in ourselves that of *Prājña*, *Taijasa* and *Vishva*.⁵⁰

We need not refer in particular to Continuity of Laws, and the question whether they are invariable or variable; nor discuss here the epistemological relations of Continuity to other concepts such as Homogeneity, Sameness, Infinity and Uniformity. These relations will be dealt with in "Chit". Here, however, we need only say a few words about certain forms of Continuity which will make its bearings somewhat clearer. In the first place, Continuity may be either absolute (*nikāntika*) or relative (*āpekshika*). The former is one which eliminates or is beyond all difference (*bheda*). *Bheda* may be of three kinds. (1) *Svagata* or intrinsic—as the difference between waves, eddies, etc., in a mass of water: it is that by which one part of a substance is discriminated from another. (2) *Sajātīya* is one by which one individual of a species (*jāti*) is distinguished from another (e.g., the difference between one man and another). (3) *Vijātīya* is one by

⁵⁰ See "Garland of Letters".

which objects of different kinds are constituted as such (*e.g.*, man and stone). Now, absolute continuity is free from these three kinds of difference. But this can be either real or pragmatic. It is *real* when difference does not exist at all. It is *pragmatic* when difference, though perhaps existing, is veiled or ignored by us. Real absolute continuity is Pure Consciousness or *Chidākāsha*. Pragmatic continuity which, as we have seen, is veiled difference, is instanced by *Desha* (Space), and *Kāla* (Time). Concretely, there *is* difference between one position and direction of Space and another—between here and there, up and down, and so on. Similarly, there *is* difference between temporal determinations—between past and future, now and then, for example. But abstractly, Space and Time are conceived by us as though they were homogeneous, uniform and impartial. Such conceptual Space and Time are the veiled products of perceptual Space and Time. On the other hand, relative continuity admits of difference of one or other of the three kinds. It is therefore unity-in-difference. Thus we speak of a continuous mass of water though waves, etc.

on it may constitute real difference. Our mental life is continuous (*i.e.*, like a stream) though the facts are infinitely various. The colours of a rainbow or a spectrum are in this way continuous. Thus also is Space continuous: so Ether; so Time; so Life. Now, this relative continuity may also be real or pragmatic. The former is illustrated by *ghatākāsha* (the Space bounded by a jar) and *mathākāsha* (the Space bounded by a temple). Here there is real (though not absolute) continuity, but this is veiled on account of certain practical determinations, *viz.*, those constituted by the jar and the temple. Pragmatic relative continuity is one in which real difference is ignored for practical purposes, and objects are thought of as being continuous. *E.g.*, the air we breathe: it is a mixture of different gases; and the particles of different gases have also their interspaces filled by a different substance. All our lower continua are thus pragmatic. What, for example, is the position of *Ākāsha*? From one standpoint, it is pragmatic or veiled continuity, *viz.*, from the absolute standpoint of *Chidākāsha*: there are real intrinsic difference in *Ākāsha* (whether as actual or as potential).

Similar is the position of the Sāmkhyan *Prakriti*. From another standpoint, however, *Ākāśha* is real continuity, *viz.*, with respect to other "continua" which are inferior to it. If we rigidly define "real" as that upon which no "veil" has operated to any extent, then the "Fact" alone is real and all "Fact-sections" (*Ākāśha*, *Kāla* and the rest) are pragmatic. Thus rigidly defined, no *relative* continuity can be real continuity: relative and real become contradictories of each other.

Then, again, continuity may be either statical or dynamical. The former is continuity of Being (*sattā*); the latter is continuity of Becoming (*parinati*). Such analysis of Fact into Being and Becoming, Consciousness and Stress, *Shiva* and *Shakti*, is, however, pragmatic. Adopting such analysis, Absolute Real Statical Continuity is *Chidākāśha* or *Shiva*; and Absolute Real Dynamical Continuity is *Chit* as Power or *Shakti*. *Chit* as Being and *Chit* as Power-to-become is real and is absolutely continuous. *Chit* is never *minus Shakti*, and *Shakti* is never *minus Chit*. The Power manifests Itself in infinite variety and such manifestation is generally cyclic; but Power

as Power suffers no change. It is the identical Power to evolve as the varied world-order: Power as such never becomes other than Itself—in this sense the *Devī* is *nityā* and *avyayā*. In the evolution of the 36 Tattvas (see *Shakti and Shākta* and *The Garland of Letters*), Power never really becomes other than the Holder of Power, and never other than Itself. The symbol of *Chhinna-mastā* (a Form of the *Devī* which shows her cutting off her own head and drinking the hot blood sprouting out of the severed trunk) is a symbol of the creative process, but it is not a symbol of self-destruction which feat even Power Itself must be incapable of achieving.

Identity, Sameness, Homogeneity are modes of the idea of Continuity: they together with the last form one family of categories. We shall not study them here. Each, we may note however, may be classified on the lines of Continuity. In what sense, for example, can Self and the Supreme Self be identified with each other? *Tvam* with *Tat*? It is absolute real (though ordinarily veiled) identity, according to Pure *Advaitism* (the realisation being *So'ham* or *Sā'ham*). It is relative and pragmatic

identity according to *Vishishtādvaitism* and the various forms of *Dvaitism*. Man is only the image of God; His part; and so on: there is real difference between Self and Supreme Reality (or Fact) which *persists*, even when the former is without its veil. The Tantra, as a *sādhana* Shāstra, leads to the realisation of *So'ham* or even beyond (*i.e.*, the transcendental, alogical state beyond the polarity of *Tat* and *Tvam*), but in the discipline it provides, there is, to begin with, *practical* recognition of duality.

The Substance-Energy of the cosmic order being fundamentally the same, we cannot have absolutely one set of laws for Matter, another set for Life, and so on; all must be ultimately governed, in so far as they are governed, by one fundamental Law or set of Laws.

§ 8

Another point should be finally noticed :

It is not enough in Philosophy to know continuity; by *Sāadhanā* we must *realise* it. As realised it is *Amritatva*—Blissful Deathlessness. There are Paths progressively leading to *Amritatva*—through Science, through Art;

through Philosophy; and through *Sādhana*, when we realise *So'ham* or *Sā'ham* (He or She am I).⁵¹

⁵¹ There will be a special volume on *Sādhana*.

Printed by J. R. Aria at the Vasanta Press, Adyar, Madras.

TANTRIK TEXTS

UNDER GENERAL EDITORSHIP OF
ARTHUR AVALON

Rs. A.

Vol. I. Tantrabhidhana with Bija-Nighantu and Mudrâ-Nighantu.—A Tantrik Dictionary, Edited by Târanâtha Vidyâratna with an Introduction in English by Arthur Avalon ... 2 0

Vol. II. Shatchakranirupana.—A work on the six centres of the body by Pûrnânanda Svâmî, with Commentary of Shangkara. *Pâdukâpanchaka*—("Fivefold footstool of the Guru"), with commentary of Kâlîcharana and Notes from the Tîkâ of Vishvanâtha on the Second Patala of Kaivalya Kâlîkâ Tantra; with an Introduction in English by Arthur Avalon ... 2 0

Vol. III. Prapanchasara Tantra.—Edited by Târanâtha Vidyâratna, with an Introduction in English by Arthur Avalon ... 3 0

Vol. IV. Kulachudamani Nigama.—Edited by Girisha Chandra Vedântatîrtha. With an Introduction by Akshaya Kumâra Maitra 2 0

Vol. V. Kularnava Tantra.—Edited by Târanâtha Vidyâratna, with Introduction in English by Arthur Avalon ... 3 0

Rs. A.

Vol. VI. Kalivilasa Tantra.—Edited by Pârvati Charana Tarkatîrtha with English Introduction by Arthur Avalon ... 2 0

Vol. VII. Shrichakrasambhara.—A Buddhist Tantra, edited by Kazi Dausamdup with a foreword on the Vajrayâna by Arthur Avalon

Vol. VIII. First Part. Tantraraja (Kâdimata), Edited by Mahâmahopâdhyâya Lakshmana Shâstri Drâvida ... 3 0

Second Part of same is in the Press.

Vol. IX. Karpuradi Stotra (Hymn to Kali), Edited with Commentary by Vimalânanda Svâmî with complete translation by A. Avalon 5 0

Vol. X. Kamakalavilasa, a work of the Kashmir School by Punyânanda with Commentary by Natanânandanâtha. Edited by Mahâmahopâdhyâya Sadâshiva Misra, with a full translation in English by A. Avalon ... 5 0

Vol. XI. Advaitabhavopanishad, Kalyanishad, Taropanishad, Kaulopanishad. Edited by Sitarâma Shâstri, with Introduction by Arthur Avalon ... 3 0

WORKS BY ARTHUR AVALON

ON TANTRA SHASTRA

Tantra of the Great Liberation. (*Mahâ-nirvâna Tantra*.) A Translation from the Sanskrit, with Introduction and Commentary by Arthur Avalon. Reprinting.

Rs. A.

Hymns to the Goddess. From the Tantra and other Shâstra and the Stotra of Shangkarâchâryya. With Introduction and Commentary. Translated from the Sanskrit by Arthur and Ellen Avalon ... 3 0

Principles of Tantra. Part I. The Tantratattva of Shrîyukta Shiva Chandra Vidyârnavâ Bhattâchârya Mahodaya. Edited with an Introduction and Commentary by Arthur Avalon ... 8 0

Do. do. Part II. With an Introduction by Shrîyukta Barada Kânta Majumdar. Edited by Arthur Avalon ... 12 0

“Wave of Bliss” (*Anandalahari*) a translation and Commentary by Arthur Avalon. *Revised Edition* ... 1 8

“Greatness of Shiva” (*Mahimnastava of Pushpadânta*), a translation and commentary by Arthur Avalon together with Sanskrit commentary of Jagannâtha Chakravartti. *In the Press* ... 1 8

The Serpent Power. (*Kundalini Yoga*) ... 20 0

BY SIR JOHN WOODROFFE

Shakti and Shakta. Essays and addresses on the Shakta Tantra Shastra. *Second Edition* 7 8

Garland of Letters. 7 8

To be had of

LUZAC & Co., LONDON
THACKER SPINK & Co., CALCUTTA
* GANESH & Co., MADRAS
TARAPOREWALA & SONS, BOMBAY

SOME PRESS NOTICES

"These Books dealing with the secret Mysticism and Magic of India are the most interesting which have been published in recent years."—*Neue Metaphysische Rundschau*.

"His book (Mahanirvana) brilliantly inaugurates the study of the Tantras, the literature of which occupies a front rank in the religious life of Modern India. The introduction to it is the most solid and exact account that has yet been written on the doctrines of the Tantras, their ontology, mystical phraseology, worship, yoga and ethics."—*Revue Critique (Professor Dr. Sylvain Levi)*.

"The translation (Mahanirvana) is distinguished by its elegance and by the profound and comprehensive knowledge by which it is backed" (and by another critic in the same journal) "Shakti and Shakta reveals a wonderful grasp of the fundamentals of consciousness".—*The Theosophist (Professor Dr. Schrader)*.

"He commenced his work with a Hindus' heart, with a Hindus' regard, and a Hindus' faith and so his translation is what it ought to be. The Introduction not only reveals the learning of its author but is also proof that he has understood in what light Hindus regard the Tantra Shastra."—(*Hitabadi*).

"In perusing the author's Introduction to the Mahanirvana Tantra we have been bewildered with

astonishment. We could never have dreamt that it was possible for a Modern Christian Englishman to so fully understand such matters as the Mode of Tantrik Sadhana. The author has certainly learnt a great deal of the inner and secret doctrine of the Tantra. We have never heard even from any Bengali Pandit such a clear exposition of Mantra Shakti as the author has given. It seems as if the World-Mother has again willed it and has again desired to manifest Her power."—*Sahitya*.

"The first really important work that I know of on the Spirit of any Ritual-philosophy."—*Hermann Keyserling (Das Reise Tagebuch Einer Philosophen)*.

"A magnificent historical and philological record due to the author, who has taken upon himself with complete success a task which might seem to be thankless but which is in reality fecund, opening for the first time an enormous and almost unknown branch of Indian literature."—*Isis (M. Masson D'Oursel)*.

"Mr. Avalon is doing a very great service for students of religions by making a small part of it (Tantra-Shastra) accessible. The Treatise (Principles of Tantra) is the most remarkable presentment on the subject which has yet appeared. It is full of points of very great interest."—*The Quest (W. Mead)*.

"Is clearly an European disciple of some Pandit belonging to the left-hand Shaktas and he shows great sympathy for the sect. He is always ready to defend any of its doctrines and practices even the most shameful. On the other hand his faithful discipleship has brought him a wonderful understanding of the teaching and cult of the sect . . . of great exegetical value."—*International Review of Missions (Dr. J. N. Farquahar)*.

“For the student of religions there is then a mine opened for his enquiries. The whole work bears the stamp of conscientiousness and accuracy.”—*Literarishches Zentralblatt fur Deutschland*.

“The first impression was of amazement and delight. The Mahanirvana is one of the most important of Hindu philosophical works combined with elaborate ritualism and its translation therefore by an European involved certainly a prodigious amount of study, sympathy and real understanding. Of the Introduction alone it may be said that for its lucidity, conciseness, directness and for its depth of penetration and insight it may itself claim to be a standard work on the much abused Tantras. We have rarely come across such an illuminating exposition of the Principles of Devi Worship.”—(*Prabuddha Bharata*.)

“Most meritorious productions. From what has been said it is clear that Avalon is right when he declares that up to now this literature has been too often judged and more often condemned without knowing it and that the Tantras deserve to become better known than has been the case hitherto.”—*Ostasiatische Zeitschrift* (Professor Dr. M. Winternitz).

“Arthur Avalon has rendered an eminent service to the Cause of Sanskrit Literature.”—*Calcutta Review* (*Mahamahopadhyaya Satish Chandra Vidya-bhushana*).

“We suspect that Arthur Avalon is one of the learned Pandits of Bengal whose native speech has not been without influence upon his almost impeccable English. We value highly the work done, if for no other reason than it gives us a real insight into the jargon of the ritual and the worthlessness of Tantrik Philosophy.”—*The Nation* (New York.)

“Illuminating discussion (‘Serpent Power’). Author makes some rarely fine brilliant definitions ... throughout maintains a strictly scientific attitude though he is obviously impressed with the extraordinary nature of the Tantrik Doctrine.”—*Britain and India*.

“There is no doubt that he has an extensive and peculiar knowledge of the subject of which he treats.”—*Luzacs Oriental List* (Dr. Barnett).

“The first fact which strikes the student of Eastern Philosophy is the Author’s extraordinary knowledge and the second is his impartiality.”—(*Shakti and Shakta.*) *New India*.

BOOKS BY SIR JOHN WOODROFFE

| | | |
|--|-------|----|
| BHARATA SHAKTI | Rs. | A. |
| 3rd Edition (Addresses on Indian Culture) | ... 1 | 8 |
| IS INDIA CIVILIZED ? | | |
| 2nd Edition | ... 2 | 8 |
| SEED OF RACE | ... 1 | 0 |
| SHAKTI AND SHAKTA | | |
| 2nd Edition (Essays and Addresses in the Tantra Shastra) | ... 7 | 8 |
| THE WORLD AS POWER | | |
| A series of volumes on Reality, Life, Mind, Matter, Conscious- ness are ready. Chit.Sakti (<i>In the Press</i>). | | |

IS INDIA CIVILIZED ?

PRESS OPINIONS

"Foreign domination has been much more than mainly political. It is the cultural and social conquest of India which is the really important one, insidious in the cause but permanent in its results. Alien culture threatens to obscure the soul of India, to swamp the Indian culture. Therefore Sir John Woodroffe's latest book is most opportune. His style is simple and convincing. The fundamental principles of Indian culture are examined with great power of insight. Sir John's purpose is to defend the minds of young India against defilement—to create a strong working faith in their own ideals and for this India will be very grateful."—*The Commonwealth (M.S.M.)*.

"Powerful exposition of Indian culture . . . Many wise political, social and religious observations abound in its inspiring pages. We can commend its perusal to all who are seekers after the truth. If it serves to induce the Europeans to abate some of their racial pride, prejudice and intolerance, and the Indians to have a more correct appreciation of their culture, then it must be regarded as a most opportune publication at the present moment when the great catastrophe in the West has shaken the faith in the basic principles of Western culture and has given a powerful stimulus to the spirit of introspection and enquiry."—*The Leader*.

"Deep insight into what is of true value in Indian culture—clear with an enthusiasm all the more effective because restrained. It is his conception of India that is the great inspiration in the book. His conception of life is Indian through and through. I have read this book all one afternoon marking page

after page its trenchant criticism of our detractors, its pen pictures of Indian life and culture and especially its illuminating description of what some of our philosophies really mean. It is as if once again as of old, one heard an ancient Guru talking to his disciples. It is a noble book for every Indian home.”—*New India* (C. Jinarajadasa).

“Sir John has already earned an abiding place in the affections of our countrymen by his intimate and profound studies of Hinduism and his enthusiastic exposition of the basis of Hindu culture. The volume in spite of the ephemeral nature of the incidents of composition has a permanent value and must find a place in the library of every self-respecting Indian.”—*Central Hindu College Magazine, The monthly organ of Benares Hindu University.*

“This matter and much more are explained with wonderful lucidity. Sir John points out that the true view of human evolution is the Eastern one and supports and illustrates his position by reference to, and also using the clear-cut and meaningful nomenclature of that system of Hindu Philosophy and Religion of which he is such a master.”—*The Hindu* (Dr. Subramanya Aiyar).

“So ably indicates the basic principles of Indian civilisation and repudiates the baseless charges with such commendable enthusiasm and righteous indignation as could have befitted one who by birth has inherited the culture—deserves study by every sincere believer in Indian thought. An admirable book—crushing reply—from start to finish shows that the author has a masterly and sympathetic grasp of the whole situation and he who goes through it will find himself in touch with the essentials of Indian Civilisation.”—*Prabuddha Bharata.*

“Sir John Woodroffe has done well to expose the fallacies underlying certain old time attacks recently reiterated—is deeply imbued with the spirit of Shakta Vedantism, and it is from this point of view that he defends Indian Civilisation. In a very fine chapter Sir John Woodroffe exhibits the various opinions held about India and her civilisation.”—*Servant of India (Professor R. D. Ranade).*

“Contains high intellectual qualities with freedom from prejudice or nonsense of any kind—the best informed work on the subject written by one not a Hindu.”—*United India and Native States.*

“The book demands the close attention of every Indian who is interested in the future of his country. It is an urgent invitation to us to appreciate better both this sacred trust and the near peril which besets it, and to stand firm and faithful in the hour of ordeal. The author develops his theory with great skill and much quiet depth and the essays are strewn throughout with acute and penetrating observations expressed with a lucid solidity which tempts one constantly to quotation.”—*Arya (Aurobindho Ghose).*

“Is throughout thought-provoking and replete with interesting passages. But those on whom Sir John's eulogisms will drop like manna from Heaven should also ponder on what (else) he has to say. It would be well for India if instead of cultivating a blind racial vanity, for which Sir John's book will furnish ample material to the unthinking bigot, we concentrate our attention on those other lessons preached by him, for only by so doing we would make a right use of the truths it contains.”—*Modern Review.*

“This noble work is a trumpet call to the Indians to realise their greatness and distinctiveness and to build the great future of India—a loving and

intimate student of a great culture.”—*Hindu Message*.

“India owes a deep debt of gratitude to Sir John Woodroffe for this timely volume in defence of Indian culture—certain social aspects have been so satisfactorily discussed and defended by this erudite defender of our civilisation that if the Indian social reformer would care to read and think over them, much of his rancour towards orthodoxy will prove baseless. India’s greatest civilisation is misunderstood by many intellectual imps both foreign and indigenous. It is a consolation to find that great minds, Indian or foreign, can realise it so well as in the case of Sir John’s. Knowledge of the inner capability of the Ego teaches but one kind of patriotism which is of course universal and not national. It is as silly to hug the degenerates of our own nationality as to hate the great souls of the other continents. But to stand for their rights when oppressed is the privilege of every right thinking man and words fail us in thanking Sir John for his humane duty; may they be ever more.”—*Mahratta*.

“Sir John writes profoundly of the Hindu religion and culture of which he is an ardent admirer and his defence of Indian Civilisation is informed with a glowing enthusiasm. He finds it easy to confound the rationalist Mr. Archer. The book will not please every Christian that reads it. But no occidental student of Indian politics should miss the reading, for it explains much in the Hindu character and point of view that before was obscure and incomprehensible. The Author believes that the ancient Hindu culture which has persisted throughout the ages, is the best for India and he is fearful lest it be lost in the political maelstrom which will follow the war.”—*Capital*.

“Great erudition—sturdy champion of Sanâtana Dharma.”—*Indian Daily News*.

“Most effective and crushing rejoinder—the work of a distinguished scholar and deep thinker—truly merits a very wide circulation in this country. It is a profoundly philosophic study of the subject.”—*Hindusthan Review*.

“The constitution of a politically dependent people can never appear to advantage because it is the interest of the politically dominant people to discredit everything belonging to the subject race as inferior. The Author has been actuated by a strict regard for truth and a desire for the establishment of true Dharma. He has not spared from criticism what is mean, calculating, vulgar, inhuman in his own countrymen, nor has he minced words in condemning what is low or servile or selfish or imitative in Indians of to-day. Actuated by the highest aims, he has really given a most remarkable and convincing book on a difficult and much-abused theme.”—*Bombay Chronicle*.

“Able written defence of Hindu civilization by a profound scholar . . . It would have been better if he had entered as much an emphatic protest against the prevailing abuses of Hindu society as he has taken care to define its virtues and ideals.”—*Everyman's Review*.

“It is rather unusual to find among the British members of the Indian Judiciary an apologist for the claims of the Neo-Hindu revivalists and their allies the Extreme Nationalists. It is in this role that we find Sir John Woodroffe figuring as a sort of modern Saul among the prophets—much of the book is occupied with an unworthy attack on Western and particularly Christian civilisation.”—*Madras Mail*.

‘From keen irritation and annoyance . . . we passed to a feeling of contempt touched by a sorry sense of amusement that the Absolute (or the Spirit or whatever else the Author wishes to call it) should indulge in the bad joke of this conflict . . . We consider both Mr. Archer and Sir John Woodroffe in this episode a nuisance . . . There is an absence of clearness even of logic . . . A person who presents such a position as this is not really and truly the friend of India.’—*The Indian Philosophical Review* (Professor A. Widgery).

“Rechauffe’ of more or less familiar arguments—without the illumination of any new thought—vague, obscure—illogical antithesis and loose and disingenuous assertions—extravagant abstraction—cannot be exempted from the charge of bias. His interpretation of the West suggests that with all his metaphysical abstractions he is unable to distinguish form from reality—vapourising, nebulous. The aspect of these essays is when not obscure, familiar; their style is provocative without being very stimulating. The confusion of issues, the multiplication of sketchy extracts without context, the breach of simple rules of logic and a running speech that gives no reason for the division into Chapters make altogether a book which is very hard to read and still harder to remember when read.”—*Englishman*.

“Sir John Woodroffe is a guide whom the reader may follow with confidence. He has lived many years in India and has shown himself to be in real sympathy with the spirit of the East; on the other hand he has not lost touch with the ideals of his own people, nor been blinded by the essential beauty of Indian tradition so as to be unaware of actual present defects; nor does he forget that those who write against or in praise of India must do so with exactness, discrimination, and the latter with

the avoidance of mere puffing general statements. He is definite and balanced and gives one the impression of being thoroughly reliable,"—*The Theosophist* (A. de L.).

"I admire the spirit of absolute fairness with which Sir John Woodroffe has approached the task—should be studied carefully by every Indian who aspires to lead the people and to mould the aspirations of his countrymen."—*Indian Review* (Hon. Mr. Justice Seshagiri Aiyar).

"The whole book is replete with useful suggestions to every one who is interested in a proper understanding of Indian culture—Sir John who has devoted many years to the study of Indian religion and who brings to his task a judicial frame of mind and abundant sympathy has no difficulty in proving the utter hollowness of Mr. Archer's conclusions."—*Vedanta Keshari*.

"Sir John Woodroffe rightly earned the gratitude of the people by his recent vigorous repudiation of the many unjust aspersions made on India and the Indians by a foreign critic." [Hon. Justice Sir Abdur Rahim in his Convocation Address (1919) to the Mysore University.]

"We have not seen any one who loves Bhârata as Sir John Woodroffe does. His pre-eminence consists in this that he has said that the service (Seva) of Bharata is the service of Shri Bhagavan." *Utsava* (R. D. M.).

By the same Author

BHARATA SHAKTI

COLLECTION OF ADDRESSES ON INDIAN CULTURE

“The thoughtful sayings of an honest foreigner, a true Muni or “Freethinker” as he himself interprets the Hindu terms . . . ought to be in the hands of every Indian. It would give him thought and self-respect. The Christian Missionary and the Christian Orientalist are the two great factors of Indian denationalisation. We fight the third factor the politician more or less successfully. We have fought the Missionary and defeated him generally but the scars of his early attacks we are unconsciously bearing as acceptable badges . . . Thus when we run down—we are unwittingly showing ourselves as Chelas of the mediocrity of Europe. Like a living organism we must cast off the foreign matter trying to bore a home into our intellectual system. Sir John does not spare the Indian mind in its analysis. He has very ably shown that our so often professed Vairagya is more often our incapacity and sometimes philosophic confusion. The little book is one of those productions which would go to make a new age in this country. It is a protest against cultural suicide of a civilisation designed by its past to live for ever.”—*Modern Review*.

“Sir John Woodroffe rarely says anything which has not an element of originality in it. He makes a powerful plea against the cultural conquest of this country by the nations of the West . . . a vigorous plea which we commend to the notice of every

true born Indian. Sir John's sympathy is bold and fearless as his scholarship is deep and erudite—he has a clear and perspective view of our culture.”—*Amrita Bazar Patrik*.

“The whole of the booklet is studded with shining gems of thought and thrilling insight into truth . . . this sterling faith in the profound individuality of India, in the glorious future which She is bound to work out for Herself, in the great mission She is to fulfil in the world, animates every word spoken in the addresses compiled in this book. We cannot, in fact, overestimate the necessity of every student of India, of every worker in Her cause, furnishing himself with a copy of this compilation and it is our ardent wish that the great exponent of the wonderful Tantrik lore of India would more often make time to come forward, as in these addresses, to contribute his weighty ideas to the keen intellectual struggle going on in our country round practical problems of re-organising our life and thought.—*Prabuddha Bharata*.

“Each of these papers is overflowing with thoughtfulness and desire to do good to Bharata. We ask every English-educated man to read it. It will give us reverence for our natural culture and will save us from the thoughtless spirit of imitation.”

“Politically India is dead. This is bad enough but if cultural conquest follows the political then She will be truly dead. Is India to be a mere name and Her culture assigned the cold room of the Oriental scholar, or is She to be a living form?” Sir John Woodroffe takes up the question with as much enthusiasm as the youngest Nationalist amongst us. His answer is one of courage and hope . . . but Sir John is not blind to the difficulties.”—*Searchlight*.

“Inspiring title—he has what is not given to many, understood the soul of India. He is a thorough sympathiser with Indian aspirations and has dwelt upon the real aim and purpose of our efforts. Ought to be read by every patriotic Indian. He will then have a clear vision and feel a new strength in his onward struggle.”—*New India*.

THE SEED OF RACE

An Essay on Indian Education.

Price Re. 1

BY SIR JOHN WOODROFFE
OPINIONS

"There is much in this little essay with which the student of India cannot but heartily agree."

—*Asiatic Review.*

"Of immense value . . . what is Sangskara, the Racial soul, the author as one who has dived deep into Indian Philosophy fully discusses in detail . . . this is the right view of Indian Education."—*Searchlight, Patna.*

All who seek knowledge as to the essentials of Indian education should possess and study carefully a copy of this book.—*New India.*

"Readers of 'Is India Civilised' will realise how well qualified the author is to offer an opinion on the maintenance of racial culture. His answer is sufficient to refute the contention of his critics that his love for the old and beautiful in Indian Culture has made his outlook reactionary."—*The Theosophist (A. de L.).*

PUBLISHED BY GANESH & CO., MADRAS